

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1309

ductive investment would be heightened through enlarged demand and through reduced corporate tax rates which will increase aftertax profits. And the production of new machines and the building of new factories, offices, stores, and apartments would further increase consumer incomes in the same way as would the expanded production of consumer goods.

No industry as large as the construction industry, as vital and as closely linked to the country's economic well-being, can afford to ignore these very real implications of the President's tax program. In the four quarters ending in the last quarter of 1962, our rate of economic growth was only 2.7 percent—compared with our entire postwar average of 3.4 percent. If in 1964 we were merely to return to this postwar average—and we fully expect to do better than that—then by the end of that year we could expect business construction expenditures, should they do no more than retain their present percentage of total output, to rise by roughly around \$2 to \$3 billion over the present \$21.2 billion. But should a new and more brisk investment atmosphere restore to business construction the proportion of total output it held in the late fifties, then we might expect expenditures to rise by more than twice that amount.

Certainly in a period of accelerated economic growth, which the tax program is designed to foster, industry will not find it sufficient to concentrate its investment in new equipment alone. For increased demand for present products, and the increased profitability of expanding present capital investment for existing goods and processes, would create a highly favorable atmosphere for new products and processes and the new plants needed to produce them.

Industry is, of course, not the only or even the largest market for the construction industry. But I think it is quite clear that in your other markets as well a similar process would occur. In 1962, for example, State and local governments financed \$11.3 billion, or almost one-fifth, of all construction activity. Yet many State and local government units have found it increasingly difficult to finance, not only many new and needed projects, but needed expansions of present projects. New schools, new urban renewal developments, greater matching funds for highways, new roads, and many other programs suffer because State and local governments simply cannot find the revenues necessary to support them.

The economic expansion we anticipate as a result of the President's tax program offers a genuine opportunity for a health increase in State and local revenues to finance needed public construction without raising State and local tax rates. This must be of more than passing importance to you in view of the increasing resistance to rises in State and local tax rates and bond issues for construction purposes.

Within a few years, the proposed tax program will lift our gross national product substantially over what it would otherwise be. Assuming that this additional growth would amount to \$50 billion per annum, then this would mean an increase of 8 percent, or \$3.5 billion, in tax revenues collected by States and local units at present effective rates. The State of Michigan, for instance, would realize \$2.5 billion as its proportionate share of the gross national product increase. Or should the induced increase in gross national product reach only a range of \$30 billion, then this would mean an increase of over 5 percent, or \$2 billion, in State and local tax revenue. Michigan's proportionate share would be \$1.5 billion. And throughout the country the reduction in Federal taxes, along with greater prosperity and lower unemployment, would lessen the pressure on local and State budgets

from welfare and relief costs, leaving more money available for other needs.

The point, I think, is abundantly clear: In the expanded economy which the President's tax program is fully capable of generating, the construction industry cannot help but thrive. But let me make it equally clear that the proposed tax program that can provide this stimulus is a program of tax reform as well as rate reduction. Nor should anyone deceive himself into believing that, without any of the proposed reforms, the tax program would be as effective as I have described it. The President himself has emphasized that of all the reforms the largest and the most important is rate reduction itself. This, however, should not be interpreted to suggest that the reforms are merely something added to the program as an afterthought with no importance in and of themselves. The reforms, I can assure you, are an essential part of the overall program.

Everyone agrees that the tax program must include, as its most important element, substantial tax reduction and rate reduction. But not everyone realizes that the proposed reforms are vital—not only in terms of equity, hardship relief, and economic growth—but to the very achievement of larger rate reductions than would be fiscally responsible without them. With the reforms it is possible to obtain rate cuts of \$13.6 billion, together with additional help for the poor and aged which bring this figure well over \$14 billion, at an overall cost of only \$8.8 billion. The reforms—including the gradual transition to a more current tax payment basis for corporations—will, in other words, offset more than \$5 billion—well over a third—of the budgetary impact of the most important part of the program, the rate reductions and hardship relief. The only way, therefore, to achieve the largest possible rate cuts within the limits of fiscal responsibility is to combine them with base-broadening tax reforms.

I do not mean to suggest that the Congress must accept the reforms in exactly the size and shape proposed by President Kennedy. As the President himself has noted, this is a matter for the Congress to decide. What I do mean is that every measure which whittles away at those reforms must be compensated for in some fashion. If one takes part of that \$5 billion offset away, one must run the risk of a greater budgetary impact with the consequent fears of inflation that this may well raise in some quarters. Or one has another alternative—one can whittle away at the rates themselves, thus blunting the overall thrust of the program by weakening its most essential part.

My point is, in short, that the reforms are an essential and integrated part of the entire program. Any effort to remove them—in part or entirely—is bound to have a price of its own. Those who oppose the reforms, whether they do so on grounds of principle or because those reforms would interfere with the benefits they would otherwise receive from the rate reductions, should reflect upon the alternatives before they commit themselves irreparably. They would look beyond what the program means in terms of dollars and cents tax cuts. They should look beyond what the program would put in their pocketbook this year, next year, or 1965. If there is one thought I would like to leave with you today it is that you and, indeed, anyone seriously concerned with the economic welfare of this Nation should look very carefully at the tax program in the light of that welfare.

This program was not devised as a quick shot in the arm for a lagging economy. It was not devised as mere adrenalin to help us cope more readily with any difficulties in the immediate road ahead. It was designed for one purpose and one purpose alone—to

lift our economy onto another plane—a plane on which it can move forward more consistently and more rapidly in the future than it has been able to in the past. This is the only kind of economy that would give us more jobs, more sales, more income—and more construction—not only for next year or for the next 2 years, but for many years and perhaps for even decades to come.

For richer or poorer, the performance of the construction industry—as of all our industry and all our people—is indissolubly wedded to the performance of our economy. And how well our economy performs in the years ahead depends on how far we today can look beyond our parochial and conflicting self-interests to the larger self-interest common to us all that the President's tax program is well designed to serve.

Cuba Free
Bay of Pigs: The Curtain Is Lifting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from U.S. News & World Report of March 18, 1963, "The Bay of Pigs: The Curtain Is Lifting," is but another story of the emerging truth of U.S. backdown.

The most disconcerting part, of course, is to learn so long after the fact what part the United States played and to learn it almost by happenstance rather than to be forthrightly told by our own national leaders.

This further story of the Bay of Pigs disaster adds to our knowledge of what took place although we have not yet been told the full story by the President and those responsible.

Under leave to extend my remarks. I include the article in the RECORD.

BAY OF PIGS: THE CURTAIN IS LIFTING

That clamp of secrecy on what happened at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961, just will not stay put. Information keeps leaking out.

Now it shows: Americans were in far deeper than officials admit. And U.S. air power was ready to go on a moment's notice.

More and more details are breaking through the curtain of secrecy to show how deeply Americans were involved in the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

For 2 years, the official story in Washington has been that the attempt to overthrow Fidel Castro in 1961 was an all-Cuban affair. But it is clear now that many Americans took part in it, and that U.S. forces were poised, ready to join in.

U.S. Navy jets, their identifying insignia painted out, were lined up on airstrips at Key West, Fla., within easy striking distance of the Bay of Pigs. They never got the signal to go.

A U.S. aircraft carrier, jets ready on her flight deck, was on station near Cuba. Other American jets were in the air almost constantly, patrolling just off the invasion beaches.

American frogmen scouted the beaches in advance of the attack, American combat veterans flew B-26 bombers into the battle zone and piloted planes carrying Cuban paratroopers who were dropped in advance of infantrymen.

None of these men were members of the regular U.S. Armed Forces, although several

A1310

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 11

were Air National Guardsmen. All were volunteers. But after word got out that four American pilots died in combat at the Bay of Pigs, President Kennedy said this at his news conference on March 6:

"Let me just say about these four men: They were serving their country."

HOW U.S. HELPED

These details can now be told. In the days just before the 1961 invasion, American frogmen swam to the landing beaches and carefully charted them for the infantry assault that was to follow. These men were civilians under contract to the invaders. All had been underwater-demolition experts in the U.S. Armed Forces at one time.

On D-day—April 17—one American frogman was with the Cuban underwater teams that went ashore ahead of the invasion. This American was in a rubber boat that was caught, by chance, in the headlights of one of Castro's jeeps. He was able to escape and get back to the mother ship, standing offshore.

At least one American is known to have piloted a planehold of Cuban paratroops from a staging base in Nicaragua to the point where they were dropped back of the beaches. En route to Cuba, they flew low over an American aircraft carrier so the Cubans could see the jets positioned on her deck.

On the second day—April 18—three American airmen flew over the invasion beach. Two, a pilot and copilot, were in a C-54 transport plane that dropped ammunition to the invaders. The third was pilot of a B-26 bomber, trying to support the invading troops with attacks on Castro's forces.

On at least one occasion, Castro jets bearing down on an invasion transport veered off when U.S. Navy fighters came on the scene, not far offshore.

It was on the last day—April 19—that four Americans were killed in two B-26 bombers over Cuba. Three other Americans did not reach the target area.

Long before the actual attack, American volunteers were working with the Cubans at their secret training base in Guatemala. Gradually, the full scope of their activities is coming to light.

U.S. B-26 PILOTS HIED

On March 7, 1963, the Chicago Sun-Times reported that Air National Guard pilots from Alabama, Arkansas and Virginia, "were offered \$2,500 a month by the Central Intelligence Agency to take part in the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961." The newspaper said pilots from the three States were "sought out because the Guard units of those States were the last to fly the B-26 bombers used in the invasion. The World War II bomber was retired from the State units in 1959."

The Chicago American identified Brig. Gen. George Reid Doster of the Alabama Air National Guard as tactical commander of the anti-Castro force. General Doster refused to confirm or deny the report, but indicated he would like to tell his story to a congressional committee. He said: "I wish they would call me and let me put my feet on a desk and talk for about 8 hours."

It had been reported earlier by U.S. News & World Report that at least 18 American airmen went to Guatemala to train Cuban pilots of the B-26 bomber fleet that the invaders had assembled. These men were recruited for combat duty. Later their orders were changed, limiting them to the role of instructors. But when things started to go wrong at the Bay of Pigs, those who wanted to be permitted to go on combat missions. At least 10, maybe more, did so.

There still is no public report by the Administration on how many Americans were involved in the invasion, or what they did. But gradually, after 2 years of silence, some of those Americans are beginning to tell their experiences. And as their accounts are pieced together, the curtain of secrecy is lifting from the Bay of Pigs.

Secretary Dillon Emphasizes Small Business Provisions of President's Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I am deeply interested in the effect of the President's tax proposals on the small business segment of our economy. Tax reductions and revisions which are of benefit to small business are long overdue.

The Treasury Department has submitted to me as chairman of the House Small Business Committee a memorandum which summarizes the principle points in the President's tax program, which affect small business. It appears that the benefits to small business under the proposed program will be extensive.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Dillon's letter and the Treasury Department's memorandum be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record. The letter and memorandum follow:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,

Washington, March 11, 1963.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing pursuant to your request a memorandum which summarizes the principal points in the President's tax program which affect small business. Since small business plays a part in virtually every segment of the economy, all the proposals in the President's program may have some direct or indirect effect, but I believe the memorandum covers the major provisions and provides a good starting point for those interested in the impact of the program on small business.

I understand that John E. Horne, Administrator, Small Business Administration, will shortly submit a more detailed analysis of the proposal as it affects small business to the Committee on Ways and Means. This statement, when it is released, may also be of use to you and the committee.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

The 4½ million small business enterprises in the United States are very important to the economy. They account for about 95 percent of all business organizations, employ about 30 million people, and are responsible for about 40 percent of total business volume.

President Kennedy's proposed tax program would benefit small business directly in a number of ways. The most important one is lower taxes. Under the program small business enterprises, whether they are corporations, partnerships or sole proprietorships, will enjoy substantial rate reduction.

Corporate income tax rates for companies with a net income of \$25,000 or less will be reduced this year from 30 to 22 percent. In 1963, corporations with taxable incomes of \$25,000 or less will get reductions of about 27 percent, compared with reductions of about 10 percent at \$50,000 and 4 percent at \$100,000.

The overall reduction in corporation tax rates will be proportionately larger for small companies. Reductions in the surtax paid by large corporations will go into effect in

1964 and 1965. But even when all three steps of the corporate tax cut are in effect, the tax reduction for small companies would be greatest. The reduction for companies with profits of \$25,000 or less would amount to about 27 percent; for those earning \$100,000 to \$1 million, it would amount to about 11 percent; and for those earning more than \$1 million annually, it would be about 10 percent. For the 467,500 corporations with incomes of \$25,000 or less, the annual tax saving would total about \$233 million.

Small business will also benefit directly from the individual income tax rate cuts, which will average considerably more than 20 percent. The reductions will be made over a 3-year period and will scale down the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a range of 14 to 65 percent. These rate cuts will help particularly the millions of individual proprietors and partners whose main, and sometimes only, source of income is from a business.

The tax program will also benefit small business indirectly in a number of ways. The reductions in individual tax rates will release a large volume of additional consumer purchasing power. More than 90 percent of the tax reduction will quickly find its way into consumer buying, boosting retail sales and, then, in turn, wholesalers' and manufacturers' sales. The resulting improvement in the business climate and confidence should be an important factor in sustaining an expanding economy.

The corporate and individual tax cuts would result in higher after-tax profits and retained earnings. The tax program will thus help remove one of the most persistent deterrents to the growth of small business—a lack of adequate capital. Because of their inability to obtain conventional long-term financing for expansion and modernization, small businesses are forced to rely on costly short-term credit, which they must continually refinance, to supplement their limited internally generated funds. Tax reduction would increase the volume of earnings which can be plowed back into small businesses to sustain their healthy growth. Tax cuts would also attract new investment to small businesses, since the profitability of such enterprises would increase. At the same time, increased profit prospects would improve their borrowing power.

Inequities which now discriminate against small business will be removed by the tax program. For example, a small business may be competing with a wholly-owned subsidiary of a large corporation; the subsidiary is a legal entity, hence able to take advantage of the benefits of the \$25,000 surtax exemption. A company with a number of such wholly-owned subsidiaries can reduce substantially its effective tax rate compared with enterprises that have equal income but are organized as a single corporate entity. Chains of multicorporate units are in effect paying small business tax rates, yet benefiting from economies inherent in large businesses. The new law would allow only one surtax exemption to multicorporate enterprises, and thus improve the competitive position of small enterprises.

OTHER TAX PROPOSALS THAT INFLUENCE SMALL BUSINESS INCLUDE

Income averaging: If a taxpayer's individual income in a given year should rise materially compared with previous years, he may find himself in a higher tax bracket. Under the administration's proposal, a taxpayer in this situation could average his current income with that of the past 4 years and if the current income amounts to more than 133 percent of the average, he would be allowed in effect to treat the excess over 133 percent as though it were earned over a 5-year period. Thus he would be taxed at a considerably reduced rate. Incomes of small unincorporated businesses, farmers, ranchers, writers, and artists vary widely

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1303

years of service, sometimes as many as 40 years or more. Why should accumulations over so great a number of years be taxed as if received over a 5-year period, or any other arbitrary period of time? If the 5-year period is adopted, it will discourage the continuance of existing profit-sharing plans and the establishment of new ones. Investment of profit-sharing funds in stock of the employer company will be discouraged with an adverse effect on the incentive impact to employees. The council is seriously concerned about the effect the Treasury Department proposals will have on profit sharing, particularly profit sharing in small companies.

The administration proposal would result in an increase in the taxes which most employees covered by deferred profit-sharing plans would pay on lump-sum distributions. An inevitable byproduct of its adoption would be a trend among employees to take their distributions over longer periods of time. This would conflict with what employees themselves prefer. A recent study by the council shows that where alternative forms of distributions were available 70 percent elected to take their benefits in a lump sum rather than in installments. The study also showed that 97 percent of the plans reporting provide for lump-sum distributions. It is also significant to note that in most cases profit-sharing plans are supplemental to fixed pension payments, such as social security, or those provided under private pension plans. The purpose of profit-sharing plans in these instances is to provide the employee with a capital sum, in addition to the guaranteed retirement income which he will receive over his retirement years, which he can use for various personal needs such as entering a business of his own, educating his children, buying a home, meeting extraordinary medical expenses, et cetera.

A further byproduct of distributions made over longer periods of time would be that the governmental revenues would be decreased over what they would be when lump-sum distributions are made. In fact many distributions which are now taxed would not be taxed at all if spread over a long enough period of years.

It has been said that the present method of taxation of lump-sum distributions from deferred profit-sharing plans is a device which principally benefits highly compensated employees. A recent survey by the council indicates that out of over 4,000 lump-sum distributions to retired employees of 223 companies during the period covered, 92 percent were made to persons whose annual compensation range was \$10,000 or less.

TREASURY PROPOSAL IS COMPLEX

The Treasury Department proposal will inject additional complexity into the tax law. Each employee receiving a lump-sum distribution must go through the following separate computations:

First, he must compute the tax on one-fifth of his lump-sum distribution plus his income other than salary received from his employer;

Second, he must compute the tax on his income other than salary income received from his employer;

Third, he must subtract the tax determined under the second step from the tax determined under the first step;

Fourth, he must multiply the resulting figure by five to obtain his partial tax attributable to his lump-sum distribution;

Fifth, he must then compute his income tax on all of his income including his salary income from his employer but excluding his lump-sum distribution; and

Sixth, he must determine his final tax by adding the partial tax on the lump sum determined under the fourth step to the tax determined under the fifth step.

The Treasury proposes to substitute this complex system in place of the present comparatively simple, well-understood capital gains method.

In addition to the 5-year averaging device, the Treasury Department proposes to continue to tax as capital gains distributions attributable to accumulations now existing under profit-sharing plans. The 5-year averaging device for part of the distribution and capital gains treatment for the remainder of the distribution inject complexities into the tax law which will make it (a) difficult for the Internal Revenue Service to administer; (b) difficult for trustees to administer; and (c) most important of all, difficult for tax-paying employees to understand.

Secretary Dillon indicated that this change in the income tax law is not designed to produce additional revenues when he stated in the technical explanation that: "For the average employee, the tax on his lump-sum distribution will be roughly the same as he would pay under the present capital gains rates." Moreover, the Treasury Department estimates that the lump-sum amendment together with other capital gains definitional changes will bring in only \$8 million additional revenue. The President has stated that tax reform should be directed to encouraging growth and employment, and that it would be unwise "to launch into a full-scale battle on general reform for academic reasons." It is respectfully submitted that in an age of \$100 billion Federal budgets, with a Federal debt in excess of \$300 billion, a proposal which involves less than \$8 million of revenue and which is so complex, must be characterized as "academic."

UNREALIZED APPRECIATION ON EMPLOYER STOCK

Now, a word about lump-sum distributions which include stock of the employer corporation. Frequently such stock appreciates in value between the time when it was acquired by the profit-sharing trust and the time when it is distributed to the employee. Under present law the employee does not have to pay tax on this unrealized appreciation of the employer company stock until the employee sells or otherwise disposes of this stock. If the employee had invested his money directly in such securities, the gain would not be taxed to him until he actually disposed of the securities, and at that time the appreciation would be taxed as capital gain. Under the Treasury Department's proposal, the appreciation on stock purchased with both employer and employee contributions would be taxed as ordinary income. Moreover, the gain would be taxed before the time that the employee actually receives his gain by selling the stock. The result is that employees will not contribute to profit-sharing plans which distribute securities of the employer, and the incentive element of such plans will be killed. In addition, the proposal will curb the desirable trend toward wider diffusion of ownership of American industry, which has been encouraged by plans which distribute securities of the employer. For these reasons the council strongly opposes any change in the present law on the taxation of lump-sum distributions which include stock of the employer corporation.

THE DEATH BENEFIT EXCLUSION UNDER SECTION 101(b)

The Secretary of the Treasury has also recommended that the present \$5,000 exclusion available to the beneficiary of a deceased profit-sharing participant, under section 101(b) of the Code, be eliminated to the extent that the deceased employee was covered by group life insurance carried by his employer. Most certainly this proposal will be detrimental to the widows and orphaned children of deceased employees who were covered under profit-sharing plans.

The council is opposed to any such pro-

posal which will run contrary to the welfare of these beneficiaries. The present exclusion under the existing law is limited to \$5,000 and certainly cannot be considered a provision to benefit highly paid employees. The council strongly urges the committee to reject this proposal because it will further diminish the value of profit sharing as an economic incentive which is so important today.

CONCLUSION

The Council of Profit Sharing Industries appreciates very much the opportunity of presenting our views to you this morning. Profit sharing is an effective means of developing cooperation and efficiency; it helps create harmonious labor-management relations; it helps create a sense of partnership between employer and employee; and it benefits employers, employees, stockholders and the Government. The number of qualified profit-sharing plans has increased since 1930 from a few plans to more than 33,000 plans today. This growth in profit-sharing plans has been materially aided by the wise tax policies adopted by Congress. We fear that the complex and inequitable proposals of the Treasury Department will have an adverse effect on the entire profit-sharing movement. We therefore urge that this committee recommend against any change in the present rules for taxing lump-sum distributions from deferred profit-sharing plans.

Ernest S. Griffith Says American Ombudsman Could Serve a Most Useful Function

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as former Chief of the Legislative Reference Service, Dr. Ernest S. Griffith has a familiarity with the problems and operations of Congress that is well known to Members of this House. Dr. Griffith, now dean of the School of International Service at the American University, has made a valuable contribution to the consideration of the possible adaptation of the Scandinavian office of Ombudsman to the American political system. I therefore call particular attention to his views on the subject. I would refer also to my remarks on the Ombudsman in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 11, 1963, pages 2078 through 2084.

Dr. Griffith's views follow:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Just a note by way of response to your letter of February 27, concerning the office of Ombudsman.

If such an officer were at the disposal of Congress, and confined his activities to serving such Congressmen who cared to use him, I believe that he might fulfill a most useful function. While I was in the Legislative Reference Service I was impressed by the way in which we of the Legislative Reference were able to assist in providing information requested by constituents. However, even so, often we were aware that there were functions in connection with specific inquiries concerning decisions in the executive branch which it was unsuitable for us to handle. Someone with more power and with the specific function of watchdog would be

A1304

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 11

required. As matters stand, this function, in many instances, is performed by the individual Members, but with very considerable unevenness—the variables being the Member's time, opportunity, his specific function within the Congress itself, etc.

As a specialist dealing with this type of inquiry, in all probability it would be welcomed by the agencies themselves, and they would learn to respect his sincerity and understanding, as well as the power of inquiry which would lay back of it. I believe to extend his role beyond this would create unnecessary complications for the executive agencies which have problems enough, in any event.

Sincerely,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,

Dean, School of International Service.

Where Reds May Take Over Next in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, so long as the Monroe Doctrine is not reimposed in this hemisphere; so long as communism, Castro and Khrushchev control Cuba; so long is the danger of subversion to the other Latin and South American countries of this hemisphere. The danger is no less real to the United States but is not so immediate as it is to the others of Latin and South America.

Where next will the Communists strike and through subversion as well as overt terror and violence cause Government to fall, to be replaced by a Communist regime?

The attached article from the March 18, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report, entitled "Where Reds May Take Over Next in Latin America" indicates that Guatemala may be next. Others have predicted Haiti. No one knows, of course, for sure which will be next. One thing, however, we know for sure that until and unless the Monroe Doctrine is reimposed someone will be next, to be followed by others.

When will our national leaders realize the terrible danger that communism poses in this hemisphere, in Cuba, not only as a military base but as a center for fomentation, unrest and revolution, in other countries of this hemisphere. Let us hope they wake up in time.

WHERE REDS MAY TAKE OVER NEXT IN LATIN AMERICA

Worry over the Communists in Cuba is likely to preoccupy the Central American Presidents and U.S. President Kennedy at their March meeting in Costa Rica.

But a king-sized headache for the United States is building up here in the largest and most populous country of Central America. It is this:

The way things are going, Guatemala could become "the next Cuba," giving the Communists a base on the mainland of the Americas.

Or, to prevent that happening, there may be a military takeover.

A PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

A political campaign is now underway to pick a successor to President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes in a national election next November. The front runner by far, at this stage, is a former President—Juan José Arévalo—who once opened the door to communism in Guatemala and went into exile when the Communists were later overthrown.

With elections little more than half a year away, the Communists and their followers are recognized as the best organized political force in Guatemala. The active anti-Communists are disorganized and divided. And the rest of the voting population seems pretty much disinterested in what happens.

Arévalo, whether he disavows it or not, has the quiet but determined support of Communists and fellow travelers. The Guatemalan Communist Party, which has had experience in running this country once, is rated as seasoned, tough and thoroughly disciplined.

WHERE REDS ARE STRONG

Hard-core membership in the party is estimated at 1,500. But party influence actually is far greater than that number indicates, since the Communists are particularly strong among students, young professional people, teachers, and in several key unions.

There is also evidence that the social security system and the lower courts have been heavily infiltrated by Reds.

A lull in Communist activities has been noticeable lately. The common belief is that the Reds are staying in the background, planning to make their move only after the elections.

With non-Communist factions divided or apathetic, political experts say the only element that remains capable of stopping the Arévalo bandwagon is the nation's armed forces. Defense Minister Enrique Peralta recently announced that Arévalo will not be permitted to take office again. The clear implication is that the military will intervene and take over the country, if necessary.

IF ARMY SHOULD ACT

But Guatemalans are beginning to doubt that the army, whose participation would be vital, has the capacity to move. After an air force uprising was put down last November, the armed forces united in a pledge of military respect for constitutional government. Now a move to block the election would be interpreted by some officers as a violation of constitutionality. The result might bring a split, with the danger of a military civil war.

It is former President Arévalo's history and background that give the major concern to those who fear a Communist takeover here.

Most Guatemalans do not consider Arévalo a Communist. He is regarded as an ambitious opportunist, with an irrational hatred of the United States. It was Arévalo, at the close of his earlier term, who arranged for Jacobo Arbenz to get the Presidency in 1951—a move that turned the country over to rule by Communists.

EXILE—FOR HEALTH

When the pro-Communist Arbenz government was overthrown by a revolt in 1954, Arévalo was out of the country, serving abroad as an ambassador. He decided it would be healthier to go into exile. He opened his present campaign while living in refuge in Mexico.

In recent months, the former President has been hard at work trying to spread the idea that his anti-Americanism is past history and that his present candidacy has the backing of the U.S. Government. His supporters have made that claim so often and so insistently, in fact, that the U.S. Embassy has been kept busy denying it.

Despite his current protestations of U.S.

friendship, many Guatemalans feel that Arévalo, once elected, would have no choice but to open the way for the Communists once again. They reason it this way: Businessmen, the church, and a good part of the armed forces, will never support Arévalo. To govern, therefore, he will have to court the continued support of the Communists who are now disguising themselves as "reformers."

Also, Arévalo's opponents point out, Fidel Castro took power in Cuba disclaiming Communist sympathies—then promptly turned the place over to them.

Complicating the political outlook here is the experience, so far, with the Alliance for Progress program.

Guatemalan officials, from President Ydigoras Fuentes on down, consider that the Alliance for Progress is too slow and too demanding in its emphasis on reforms to be of much help to the local economy. They have adopted a land-reform law and the first income tax in the country's history in the hope of starting Alliance money flowing. But they insist that both changes are going to hurt Guatemala's economy in the long run.

WHY LOANS LAG

Since March of 1961—the date the Alliance for Progress is considered to have gone into effect—Guatemala has received less than \$10 million in new loans. This, combined with \$26 million which was still in the pipeline of past aid programs when the Alliance for Progress started, gives the country a total of \$36 million in loans that have not yet been drawn down.

According to U.S. officials, the reason Guatemala doesn't get loans faster is that it doesn't take the action necessary to set the loans in motion. They tell stories of loans that were not drawn against for months because officials didn't get around to opening bids. In other instances, the Government has failed to prepare projects that would justify loans for technical assistance.

Alliance loans for water and sewerage projects and for low-income housing remained unused, say U.S. officials, because Guatemala was supposed to put up one-third of the amount, and claimed she didn't have the money to do so.

A WESTERN SIZEUP

One Western official stationed here says that the whole trouble is that the Government "doesn't have the slightest idea of what the Alliance is all about." His explanation:

"What is wrong is that you are dealing with a society here that has a concept of mankind opposed to that of Western civilization. In Guatemala, the educated, the people of means and their children, are interested only in amassing as much as they can for themselves and their families. They have no sense of obligation to the rest of society."

Says another official: "You would think that after Cuba, in self-interest, these people would change to relieve some of the economic pressure on the rest of population. However, they are as uncompromising as ever."

There are plenty of problems here, regardless of who is to blame.

Operating expenses of the Government go up and up. Until last June, the United States donated \$10 million a year to support Guatemala's budget. This has since been cut off, and the Government—with a budget of \$105 million—now has running debts with its suppliers of between \$15 and \$18 million.

Next to Venezuela, Guatemala has the highest cost of living in Latin America. Critics say this is because the Government imposed high protective tariffs to raise income and stimulate local production. As a

result, everything from food to manufactured goods is expensive.

An imported automobile tire that cost \$25 before present import taxes were imposed now sells for \$50. A man's shirt that used to sell for \$3.25 now costs \$7. A chicken costs \$3.50, in a country where the per capita income is estimated at about \$175 a year.

The escape valve for Guatemalans is the fact that most of them live close to the land, out of the money economy. Conditions, nevertheless, are bad. There is widespread unemployment, and an even larger problem of underemployment.

After student riots last year, a flight of capital developed. There is a lack of new investment. U.S. private investment is estimated at \$125 million. But neither foreigners nor Guatemalan investors seem willing to put new money into the economy. This has been accentuated by uncertainty over the election.

HEADING FOR TROUBLE?

Outwardly, there is an impression of relative calm in Guatemala City. Yet, when you listen more closely, you hear worried people everywhere saying that their country needs peace, but it is heading toward chaos and conflict.

For the rest of Central America, and for the United States, the worry is that out of conflict and chaos will emerge one of two things: another military dictatorship, or another Cuba.

Katyn Forest Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stefan Pomierski, a constituent of mine who truly understands the nature of the Communist beast has written me of the Katyn Forest massacre of thousands of Polish officers, by the Russian Communists, 23 years ago, and I feel his letter should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read:

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR STEVE: As we are approaching another Spring, in many communities wherever Americans of Polish extraction will be gathering, they will pause in a few moments of silence to pray for the souls of some ten thousand Polish officers massacred in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, Russia in the gruesome days of the Spring of 1940.

Material gathered by the Polish Government-in-exile (at present in London) and by a congressional committee investigating the facts, evidence and circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre, without doubt establish the identity of the perpetrators of the cruel mass murder as the evil and godless forces of the Red Kremlin.

It is said that this material is sufficiently convincing to present all the facts to the General Assembly of the United Nations requesting an indictment of the guilty parties.

On this 23d anniversary of the Katyn Massacre, the voices of the souls of these murdered Polish officers go out to this great country of ours, which has always stood in the defense of justice and honor, in the hope that neither fear nor timidity will induce the leaders of the free world to be silent, when fortitude and firmness and courage in a just cause be tested, be it the rape and be-

trayal of the Polish nation at Yalta, the Katyn massacre, the Budapest slaughter and the ever increasing menace at our own doorstep.

In this grave hour, we must be more than mindful that godless Communism, which is boldly encircling us, operates by means of deceit and tyranny, by treachery and murder.

As a citizen of this great country of ours, and as your constituent I would be remiss in my duty if I would not bring my viewpoints, which I am sure are shared with many constituents of yours, to your good attention.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

K. STEFAN POMIERSKI,

Florida Port Calls for Closing All Trade With Countries Aiding Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, support continues to grow for strong action by the United States against those countries which permit their ships to supply Communist Cuba.

Recently the governing body of Port Everglades, one of the largest and busiest ports in the Southeast, went on record supporting the closing of all U.S. ports to the ships engaged in Cuban trade.

I ask that this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, and want to personally thank the Broward County Port Authority for their support, which is an indication of the personal sacrifices that our public officials and citizens are willing to make to eliminate this Cuban threat to the security of all the Americas.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 12-1963

Resolution of the Port Commission of the Broward County Port Authority expressing its endorsement and urging the adoption of a policy by the United States of America closing all American ports to vessels engaged in commerce or trade with the Republic of Cuba.

Whereas in view of the current Cuban crisis there is a growing sentiment among the citizens and residents of the United States of America that all American ports should be closed to commerce and trade dealing with the Republic of Cuba; and

Whereas this sentiment has been exemplified as representative of the citizens and residents of the State of Florida by expressions of the Honorable PAUL G. ROGERS, Representative from the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Florida, on the floor of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress; and

Whereas the Port Commission of the Broward County Port Authority is charged with the responsibility of the operation of Port Everglades in Broward County, Fla., which said port is a deepwater harbor which accommodates vessels which have dealt in commerce and trade with the Republic of Cuba, and is therefore cognizant of and vitally interested in the significance of such continued commerce and trade: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Port Commission of the

Broward County Port Authority, That it goes on record as being in favor of the United States of America adopting a policy which will close all American ports to vessels directly or indirectly engaged in commerce with the Republic of Cuba; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forthwith forwarded to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, the Honorable Spessard L. Holland and the Honorable George A. Smathers, Senators, and the Honorable Paul G. Rogers, Representative, and to such other persons in positions of public confidence and trust as shall be appropriate.

Adopted at Port Everglades, Fla., this 19th day of February, A.D. 1963.

KERMIT E. WHITSON,

Chairman, Broward County Port Authority.

Attest:

OLIVIA M. WOODS,
Deputy Port Secretary.

Communist Racism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about what purports to be a new look in the Soviet Union. Chairman Khrushchev has with great ceremony turned his back on what he describes as the errors of the Stalinist era and has broadcast to the world much about the new freedoms he alleges individuals now enjoy in the U.S.S.R.

However, while the Soviets have undeniably made some progress in material things since the collapse of czarism in 1918, there is serious question as to whether comparable strides have been made in human freedoms. As a recent editorial in the Jersey Journal points out:

Having done so well in material things, the next great stride forward must be in the matter of human freedom. Today's Russians have rejected some of the unnatural restrictions on normal human thinking which were attempted in the early days of their revolution. To complete freeing the individual, they must now cease their relentless campaign against religion.

This is a challenge which the Soviets cannot answer with another propaganda bombast; the reply must be found in true freedom of conscience and enjoyment of human rights within the borders of the U.S.S.R. Present-day Soviet anti-Semitism is a stern warning to the believer of all faiths as to what they might expect from Communist dictatorship. Soviet actions permit no other interpretations. The world—and especially the new nations of Asia and Africa—will pass stern judgment on Soviet racism as the sordid facts are brought to light.

The December 7 editorial of the Jersey Journal follows:

CABLE TO KHRUSHCHEV

Life within the Soviet Union and relationships between that country and its neighbors in the world would be far better if Nikita Khrushchev would take the advice

given in a cablegram which is reproduced today on page 11.

It is signed by a large group of Protestant, Jewish and Catholic leaders, among them some of our best known clergymen.

They are protesting specifically the Soviet Union's treatment of Jews, but on a broader scale they are protesting the Communist lack of appreciation of all religion.

Just how bad it is was reported thoroughly only a few months ago when Lee Hills, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, led a group of American editors through a long tour of Russia. On his return he wrote a complete report about the Soviet effort to stamp out religion and went on to say:

"Some say it is harder to be a Jew today in the U.S.S.R. than in the Russia of the Czars, which invented the word 'pogrom'."

This persecution is all part of a general and stupid policy whereby the people of the Soviet Union are denied religious expression. Yet probably no one act could make Russia a better neighbor to all people than for Khrushchev to conclude a concordat with all religions. Understanding and appreciation of religion would mean the end of the absurd restrictions which require people to be walled into their homeland, to hear only what the jamming apparatus will allow radio and television to bring, to say only what the local commissar will clear through censorship.

The Soviet Union in the 45 years since its revolution has made phenomenal material strides. It has built huge industries, it has developed housing and welfare programs, it has sent satellites and men into space. It has recovered from the terrible wound of a great war. Slowly Russia is breaking with the economic contradictions bundled under the label "Marxism-Leninism."

Having done so well in material things, the next great stride forward must be in the matter of human freedom.

Today's Russians have rejected some of the unnatural restrictions on normal human thinking which were attempted in the early days of their revolution.

To complete freeing the individual, they must now cease their relentless campaign against religion.

American Public Power Association Advocates Authorization of Devils Jumps Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, authorization of the Devils Jumps Dam on the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River is now under consideration by the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee.

The American Public Power Association has joined with members of the Tennessee and Kentucky delegations and numerous other individuals and associations in supporting and urging the authorization of this project.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the American Public Power Association in support of the Devils Jumps Dam be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION TO HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL—RIVERS AND HARBORS RE AUTHORIZATION OF DEVILS JUMPS PROJECT, FEBRUARY 27, 1963

American Public Power Association is a national trade organization representing more than 1,100 local publicly owned electric utilities, mainly municipal systems, in 44 States and Puerto Rico with offices at 919 18th Street NW, Washington, D.C.

APPA supports technically and economically feasible Federal multiple-purpose water projects with hydroelectric potential because: (a) some 375 public power systems purchase part or all of their power supply from Federal power marketing agencies; (b) comprehensive river development dictates that maximum use be made of water resources for all purposes, including creation of electricity; (c) power is a paying partner which returns its full cost plus interest to the Treasury and frequently provides financing for other beneficial programs, such as irrigation; (d) the Federal power program aids the entire economy by supplying needed new sources of electrical energy; and (e) Federal generation and congressionally established sales policies encourage availability of inexpensive electricity through formation of a competitive yardstick.

For these reasons, APPA asks favorable consideration of the multipurpose dam and reservoir on the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River at Devils Jumps.

Devils Jumps would provide 480,000 kilowatts of installed capacity. Project evaluation in accordance with standards established by the President last year show a benefit-cost ratio of 1.9 to 1 for a 50-year period, 2.4 to 1 for a 100-year period.

An appreciable diversity in the flows and consequent minimum pool levels at Wolf Creek and Devils Jumps will give Devils Jumps a dependable capacity of 510,000 kilowatts when system dependable capacity is lowest. With 255,000 acre-feet of flood-control storage transferred to Devils Jumps, Lake Cumberland could be operated with a higher head. The result would be an increase in dependable capacity of 86,000 kilowatts and 40 million kilowatt-hours of average annual energy at Wolf Creek and 18 million kilowatt-hours annually at Old Hickory, Cheatham, and Barkely projects. Increase in regulated flows would also benefit the Cordell Hull and Celina projects.

The Devils Jumps project power could be marketed to local public agencies. Power from this project could be available to Kentucky, Indiana, and Ohio, States in which there are more than 200 municipal electric systems, numerous rural electric cooperatives, and Federal agencies. Many of these municipalities have no supply of low-cost power. Power from Devils Jumps, with adequate transmission, may help maintain the integrity of these municipal systems and assure continuation of their yardstick rate.

APPA recommends authorization of the Devils Jumps project, and urges early action on the part of Congress to provide funds for the project.

Fair Housing for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on this centennial year of the Emancipation Proclamation, the city of Berkeley, in the Seventh California District which I

have the privilege to represent, is facing a significant test of whether "all men are created equal," or whether "they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

These are, of course, promises of our Declaration of Independence; they are promises which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. But Berkeley, like too many cities throughout our country, is confronted with the fact that our practices do not always match our precepts, that our deeds are not always as good as our words.

On April 2, the residents of Berkeley will vote on an ordinance recommended by a distinguished and representative 18-member citizens committee, and adopted by the city council, to establish a fair housing ordinance—to establish an ordinance prohibiting discrimination in the sale, rental, or lease of housing because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

This ordinance is sound because it is designed to correct a demonstrated inequity. As the citizens committee stated in its report:

Accumulated evidence shows that discrimination in housing within the city is widespread and general, in both rental and sale of housing.

This ordinance is sound because it stresses the moderate approach of education, conferences, conciliation, and persuasion, with only final resort to public hearings and court action.

This ordinance is sound because it does not mean that an individual must sell or rent to a minority group member because he is a member of that group. It means rather, that housing cannot be withheld only because the applicant is a member of a minority group.

Finally, this ordinance is workable on the actual experience of 10 States and 8 cities which have similar laws.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination is economically wasteful. It is dangerous to our position in the world community. It is contrary to the standards upon which this country has risen to greatness. Above all, it is morally wrong.

As President Kennedy stated it so clearly in his civil rights message last month:

Let it be clear, in our own hearts and minds, that it is not merely because of the cold war, and not merely because of the economic waste of discrimination, that we are committed to achieving true equality of opportunity. The basic reason is because it is right.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Berkeley have an opportunity with this fair housing ordinance to make a major attack on the dread disease of discrimination. They have an opportunity to further insure the basic civil rights promised and guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. They have an opportunity to practice one of the fundamental precepts of America—the equal worth of every human being regardless of his race or color.

As an advocate of home rule, as a resident of Berkeley—one of our pioneering American cities in the field of good government—and as an American citizen, I am supporting this fair hous-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1237

Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, reported today. However, at least an additional billion board feet is expected to be produced through salvage of windthrown timber resulting from the severe west coast storm in October 1962. This excess production would be added to inventory and would

tend to depress softwood lumber prices. Lumber imports will probably total about 5.3 billion board feet in 1963, a rise of 8.5 percent.

Statistical summary

Statistics for 1961 and 1962 and estimates for 1963 are as follows:

	1961	1962	1963 ¹	Percent change	
				1961-62	1962-63
Production (million board feet).....	31,843	32,886	34,330	+3.3	+4.4
Value of shipments (thousand dollars) ²	2,591,000	2,700,000	2,800,000	+4.2	+3.7
Quantity of imports (million board feet).....	4,248	4,884	5,300	+15.0	+8.5
Value of imports (thousand dollars).....	312,616	368,902	400,000	+18.0	+8.4
Quantity of exports (million board feet).....	755	792	830	+4.9	+4.8
Value of exports (thousand dollars).....	87,163	91,598	96,000	+5.1	+4.8

¹ Estimated.

² An additional billion board feet may result from salvage of windthrown timber.

³ Sawmill and planing mill products (not related to production figures).

Source: Bureau of the Census.

OUTLOOK FOR 1963

The lumber industry (standard industrial classification code 2421) comprises approximately 32,000 establishments employing about 240,000 people.

Lumber consumption is expected to total 38.8 billion board feet in 1963, about 5 percent more than in 1962. Prospects for the principal lumber-consuming industries are generally favorable. In the construction industry, total construction lumber requirements in 1963 are expected to equal or exceed those in 1962.

Expenditures for private and public construction are expected to be 3.3 percent greater than in 1962. Construction of new housing, largest single user of new lumber, is expected to increase slightly in 1963. Construction of multifamily housing (two or more units), which has increased sharply in recent years, is expected to level off at slightly more than the 32 percent of total housing construction reached in 1962. Total consumption of lumber in residential construction has been held down in recent years because these multifamily units require less lumber than single-family structures. Expenditures for residential alterations and repairs and for nonresidential construction (industrial, commercial, religious, educational, etc.) are also expected to rise slightly in 1963.

The pallet industry, one of the fastest growing lumber-consuming industries, used an estimated 1.7 billion board feet of lumber in 1962, which was 5 percent of total domestic production. Pallet production totaled 68 million units in 1962, compared with 64 million in 1961. Production has increased steadily in the last 4 years—the 1962 increase amounting to the largest on record. Production in 1963 is expected to gain modestly.

Shipments of nailed and wirebound boxes and crates will probably increase about 5 percent in 1963. Shipments of nailed wooden boxes and crates were about 7 percent higher in 1962 than in 1961, and those of wirebound boxes and crates were 3 to 4 percent higher.

Total shipments of household furniture may be about 4 percent greater in 1963 than the record high attained in 1962. Value of shipments of upholstered wood furniture (case goods) totaled \$1.6 billion in 1962, compared with \$1.4 billion in 1961. Value of shipments of upholstered furniture was \$906 million in 1962, a record annual increase over the \$802 million reported for 1961. Value of shipments of wood office furniture may increase about 2 percent over the total in 1962 of \$89 million.

About 33 percent more railroad freight cars are expected to be constructed in 1963. The railroads also expect to upgrade a larger number of older cars, thus tending to increase the consumption of lumber. In 1962, 36,555 new freight cars of all kinds were built, 12.5 percent more than the 31,720 cars built in 1961. The construction of cars using wood, accounting for about one-third of the total, increased at approximately the same rate. Procurement of railroad ties is expected to increase 5 percent over the quantity purchased in 1962, when the increase was 20 to 25 percent over purchases in 1961.

In addition to demand from wood-using industries, lumber production in 1963 will also be strongly affected by the level of imports (especially of softwood lumber) and the salvage of west coast timber blown down by the severe storm in October 1962.

Total imports have risen from 1.3 billion board feet in 1947 (3.7 percent of apparent domestic consumption) to 4.9 billion board feet in 1962 (13.2 percent of consumption). Imports of softwood, accounting for 94 percent of total imports in 1962, have increased rapidly in recent years, as follows:

Year	Million board feet	Percent of total softwood consumption
1947.....	1,096	4.1
1960.....	3,636	12.5
1961.....	4,004	13.7
1962.....	4,573	15.0
1963 (estimate).....	5,100	15.5

Source: Bureau of the Census; estimate for 1963, Forest Products Division, BDSA.

On the basis of recent trends, total lumber imports in 1963 should be about 5.3 billion board feet.

A severe storm on the west coast in October 1962 blew down 11.2 billion board feet of timber. To prevent an epidemic infestation of bark beetles and consequent additional loss of green timber, this timber must be removed rapidly. The salvaged timber is expected to boost production of logs (including sawlogs, pulpwood logs, veneer logs, etc.) from 1 to 2 billion board feet above the level which might otherwise be expected.

Growing demand for lumber in industrialized countries and export promotion programs of both Government and industry may increase exports to 830 million board feet in 1963, a 5-percent gain over 1962.

At the estimated levels of consumption, imports, and exports, lumber production of about 34.3 billion board feet will be required to meet domestic demand in 1963. Salvage of windthrown timber would raise total pro-

duction by at least 1 billion board feet, which would be added to inventory.

The average wholesale price index for all lumber was 96.5 in 1962 (1957-59=100), compared with 94.7 in 1961 and 99.8 in 1960. The index for softwood in these years was 95.9, 93.5, and 98.6, respectively. Excess production resulting from salvage of blown-down timber would tend to depress softwood prices in 1963. It is estimated that each 300 million board feet produced in excess of demand would reduce the price \$1 per thousand board feet.

RESOLUTION

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled: We, the members of the Ferry County Timbermen's Association, do respectfully represent that:

Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasingly yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

Whereas a serious blowdown of timber occurred in Washington, Oregon, and California in October of 1962 and salvage of said blowdown timber will place a further burden on the orderly marketing of lumber from other domestic areas; and

Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to advantages such as: (1) depreciated currency; (2) low stumpage rates; (3) non-competitive bidding; (4) less costly and restrictive forest practices; (5) lower wage rates; (6) high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada; (7) low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping; (8) a co-operative Government; and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress and President of the United States of America, be respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes and deterioration of communities; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

Passed the 17th day of January 1963, at regular meeting of Ferry County Timbermen's Association.

Attest:

FRED C. LEJAUR,
President.
IRA MERRITT,
Secretary.

A1298

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 11

The Difference Between Republican and Democratic Policies on Cuba and Planned Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, very often in speaking with Republican groups around this country I have stated that if every party organization in the United States worked as diligently and as effectively as the Washington Republicans under the leadership of Carl Shipley, we would never lose elections. This is particularly significant when one realizes that in Washington neither a Democrat nor a Republican can vote but, nevertheless, these people feel an obligation to the two-party system which has made them a most effective organization.

Their leader, Mr. Carl Shipley, one of Washington's outstanding citizens, recently addressed the adult seminar of the Church of the Brethren at the Dodge Hotel in Washington, and his remarks are so pertinent and important to our time, that I ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOP CHAIRMAN CARL SHIPLEY TO ADULT SEMINAR OF CHURCH OF THE BROTHERS

Discussion of alternatives is the vital ingredient of the democratic process. Representative Government based on our two-party system would wither and die without the stimulus of conflicting proposals by the Republican and Democratic Parties. The differences between the national goals of the Kennedy administration and Republicans, with respect to Cuba and planned deficits, are wide and deep.

The Republican Party has consistently urged programs looking toward victory in the cold war. The Kennedy administration has apparently abandoned victory as a national goal. It is committed to settling for half-a-loaf compromises, coalitions, and concessions. Peace at any price is the Kennedy program. This policy has led us to the brink of disaster in Cuba. The Kennedy administration's smoke screen of explanation that the hundreds of torpedo boats and ground-to-air missile fighters are defensive, that the Russian submarine base in Cuba is no threat, and that the 17,000 Russian soldiers are simply housekeepers, leads the Nation away on a false scent. We must move forward in the spirit of Teddy Roosevelt and the Rough Riders. We must remove the Russian military threat from Cuba at whatever the cost. First we need a total blockade by ground, air, sea, and communications media. Then recognition of a Cuban Government in exile. Next, support of anti-Castro Cubans financially and militarily to retake Cuba. If that fails, we must invade with our own forces. Americans can never accept a contemptuous disregard of the Monroe Doctrine by Communist Russia or the presence of a Russian satellite government in Cuba on a permanent basis. And we cannot wait for Cuba to fall from within—as we have with Hungary, Poland, and all the others. Coexistence is completely out of the question, and the Ken-

neddy administration is dead wrong in pursuing that goal. Some Americans living today recall the storming of San Juan Hill, when our country under Republican leaders removed a foreign military presence from Cuba. The reasons for eliminating Russian influence from Cuba today are much greater than the reasons which moved our country in the days of Gen. Leonard Wood, Col. Teddy Roosevelt, and Admiral Dewey. Let us not be hoodwinked by the Kennedy administration's soft sell on the danger which confronts us just 90 miles away.

The second great difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties focuses around the Kennedy administration's planned deficits and planned inflation. This is their complicated proposal to cut taxes by \$10 billion, increase the budget to nearly \$100 billion, and shift the tax burden away from the lower and higher economic groups on to the middle class. Family, church, business, and community life in the United States is based on sound pay-as-you-go theories of a balance between income and outgo, and a distribution of the tax burden, so that every citizen from the lowest economic group to the highest bears a fair and proportionate share of the ever-increasing cost of government.

For the first time in the history of our country, the Kennedy administration has put forward a proposal to abandon this basic premise and commit the country to a program of planned deficits and constant expenditures greater than income. Just a few examples of the Kennedy tax proposal illustrate the situation. First, Mr. Kennedy would take a million taxpayers completely off the tax rolls at the lower end and reduce the tax on highest incomes from 91 to 65 percent. Next, Mr. Kennedy would virtually steal from the churches, schools, and charities by depriving millions of taxpayers of a portion of their charitable deductions, by putting a 5-percent floor under church and school contributions. He would take away over \$3.2 billion in deductions from this group. Mr. Kennedy has proposed to take away the sick pay and retirement pay exemptions, and to take away the \$50 exclusion and 4 percent credit on dividends. This all strikes hard at retired persons, sick persons, and those on pensions or other fixed incomes. Mr. Kennedy would deprive homeowners of their mortgage interest deduction and deprive real estate and estate transfers of capital gains treatment. He would extend the holding period on capital gains. These are all devious tax increases, to offset the promised tax cut. Excessive taxes must be cut, but only when nonessential expenses are cut. The Kennedy proposal is fiscal folly.

Robert Frost—Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following poem written in honor of Robert Frost by Miss Marty Hale, the Old Spinner, of Steubenville, Ohio:

ROBERT FROST—IN MEMORIAM

(By Marty Hale, Steubenville, Ohio)

Unmindful of the sun's bright glare,
Or wind that ruffled his whitened hair—
He was majestic, standing there

To add his bit of sentiment—
The words with serious intent—
To honor our new President.

The sun was bright—he could not see
Those words—and yet how gallantly
He praised our country's history.

Many loved poets we recall,
Some have achieved that magic call,
But he was greatest of them all.

He struggled, and he reached his goal,
Sometimes it takes a heavy toll—
A poet writer his heart and soul.

These words of his we keep apart,
Perhaps a vagrant tear may start—
They'll live forever in our heart:

"Your woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep."

An emptiness—a world that wept—
Those promises have all been kept,
Because today the poet slept.

That Uncuttable Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial entitled "That Uncuttable Budget" from the St. Marys (Pa.) Daily Press of March 1, 1963:

THAT UNCUTTABLE BUDGET

Washington was treated the other day to the unusual sight of a Congressman protesting Federal spending in his State. Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican, of Wisconsin, opposed plans of the Area Redevelopment Agency to build a \$418,000 paper mill in Wisconsin. It would produce paper products just like other mills in the State turn out, and the existing mills are running far under capacity. Transferring orders from old mills to the new ones will transfer jobs as well, and no new jobs will be created.

This is a small matter in the \$99 billion the administration proposes to spend in 1964. But it's one of many unwise, unnecessary, and foolish programs that go to make it an all-time record budget.

The budget adds new programs to the old ones, and increases spending in nearly every category. The "savings" of which the politicians speak do not represent only slow-down of spending, but turn out to be sales of Government property in some cases, and transferring lending functions to private hands in others. The budgets for payroll, overhead, and programs rise.

The Government Economy Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers has suggested savings of \$2.8 billion in fiscal 1964 spending in a preliminary study of the budget requests, and promises to hurt more fat as time goes on. The NAM objects to \$250 million in new military housing, for example, on the grounds that the housing shortage which led to the program in the first place is long over. It questions \$763 million of foreign aid to nations which have shown little capacity to use it, and little allegiance to free world purposes.

Budget Director Kermit Gordon defended the budget by citing the rise in population, but he's new in the job and may not have

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1299

heard that Federal expense has been out-running population growth for years now.

Democrats and Republicans in Congress alike are alarmed at the size of the budget, and the \$11 billion deficit forecast—particularly as last year's forecast of a half billion surplus became a realized \$8 billion deficit.

The budget can be, should be, and must be cut.

Congress Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is often criticized and regrettably is rarely commended. Congress, as an institution, is often made the national whipping boy and all too infrequently commended.

It is refreshing, therefore, to read a recent article by Columnist Jenkins Lloyd Jones, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star commending Congress. I believe this article is worthy of wider reading, and I ask unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record. The article follows:

CONGRESS ADMIRABLE FOR BEHAVIOR—ABSENCE OF TURBULENCE ON FLOOR CREDITED WITH HELPING SUCCESS

It was one of those awful days in the U.S. Senate when a handful of Senators were just standing around beating their gums to empty desks and the puzzled galleries.

The upper House was in a state of paralysis because the liberals had introduced a move to kill filibusters by a three-fifths vote instead of the traditional two-thirds vote, and with the rules up in the air the Senate couldn't organize and the committees couldn't be appointed and so, a month after the beginning of the session, nothing was going on.

Vice President JOHNSON was up on the high chair. A couple of freshmen, Ted KENNEDY of the well-known family and HOWARD EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, sat around still, presumably, entranced by the newness of it all. Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia was conducting a filibuster on the filibuster, and every once in a while he would refer to the Senate's being like Caesar's wife and again to its being in Abraham's bosom.

Occasionally, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, would ask permission to make a brief comment that wasn't brief and once Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio asked to interrupt so that he might call attention to the wonderful Ukrainians who were being ground down beneath the Kremlin's heel, whereupon Senator SCOTT of Pennsylvania, mindful of his own Ukrainians in Pittsburgh, fell all over himself seconding Senator LAUSCHE's sentiments.

I was killing an hour in the practically empty Press Gallery and I kept my eye on a couple of young men across the way in the visitors' seats. One had a beard and they were enjoying themselves hugely and about to die with suppressed merriment at the grotesque performance on the floor. You could just hear them at their next cocktail party laughing Congress to death.

But here's one uncynical newspaperman. Strangely, I come away from either House—

even on a terrible day such as that one—with admiration.

The U.S. Congress is probably the best behaved parliament in the world. The raucous and raffish cries of "murder," "Treason and shame, that characterize that lively debates in Westminster are almost never heard in the Capitol. There is none of the turbulence of the Chambre de Deputes in Paris, or the House of the People in New Delhi or the Israel Knesset. Not since Preston Brooks of South Carolina nearly brained Charles Sumner of Massachusetts 111 years ago has the Senate floor seen a serious fight.

The Congress shows its sophistication by doing practically all its significant work in committee, or at least away from the floor. The floor is largely window dressing—speeches to the Gallery and remarks for the record—and, of course, formal voting. Votes may be changed by quiet persuasion or adroit pressure in the corridors, but rarely by frenetic debate in full assembly.

In the new republics all eyes are on the rough-and-tumble Congresses. There is the place of passion and oratory and recrimination and contention. And here are spawned the dictators.

For popular government can't survive disorder and chaos. The confusion of mob government in the Agora in Athens brought forth Pericles. The corruption in the Roman Senate made Caesar inevitable. The irresponsibility of the French deputies finally drove the nation into the arms of General de Gaulle.

A republic is a fragile thing. The price of its survival is a reasonable efficiency. Yet popular government is inherently inefficient. It is full of lost motion, confusion and indecision. It moves forward under the weak force of persuasion instead of the strong force of personal power.

The U.S. Congress has been a success. Over 180 years, in spite of a host of mountebanks and incompetents and a few genuine rascals, it has listened more often than not to the voice of reason. It has, surprisingly perhaps, usually recognized real leadership and devoted patriotism. Its Members—most of them—work desperately hard.

It may, of course, decay. Perhaps its golden age has already passed. Congress is a reflection of the people and the greed of the people has this year brought financial irresponsibility to a new high. If we ever have a crashing dollar and a national paralysis we may well lose the right to elect our representatives.

But, even if, that happens, history will remember the U.S. Congress. For its time it reached a high point in the delicate art of deliberation. Reportedly, it showed generosity in triumph and strength in crisis. It had tradition and pride. It molded a lot of good vessels, some out of pretty ordinary clay.

I never leave the Gallery, even after listening to sonorous rhetoric rolling over empty seats, without marveling that the whole thing could have lasted so long and performed so well.

Hon. Lew Deschler

SPEECH
OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in all the words they have uttered in praise of our able Parliamentarian Lew Deschler. Lew was on

the job when I came to Congress almost a quarter of a century ago, and I learned quickly to seek his counsel and advice, all of which proved to be good. Lew Deschler possesses that sixth sense, to see the right, and to live right during every minute of the day.

I could go on for hours, Mr. Speaker, expounding my high esteem of this great and good man, but it is simply not possible to gild the rose, neither is it possible to say anything that would add to the love and high esteem that all have who know well, my friend, Lew Deschler.

I only wish for you, Lew, many more years of service to the Members of Congress and to our beloved Nation, which you have served so well for over one-third of a century.

Cuba

Blockade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial by David Lawrence in the U.S. News & World Report issue of March 18, 1963, entitled "Blockade," points out the truth that many American citizens know even if the President and his military and State Department advisers do not know.

Cuba is a threat militarily, politically, and in every other way to us and the nations of this hemisphere. The longer we postpone taking the necessary action, first to neutralize the danger and then to remove the danger and the threat, the more difficult will the task become. There is no point further in quibbling over kinds of blockades although the pacific blockade mentioned by Mr. Lawrence is pertinent. The main thing is to prevent further military buildup while we determine militarily what action is necessary to reimpose the Monroe Doctrine in this hemisphere, which means freeing Cuba of communism of any form, Castro, or Khrushchev.

The editorial follows:

BLOCKADE

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy told his news conference on March 6 that the primary source of the shipments into Cuba today are bloc ships. This, of course, means that, under orders from Moscow, the Communist-bloc countries of Eastern Europe are sending to Castro not only military equipment but oil and other goods essential to Cuba's economic survival.

The American people, on the other hand, are furnishing what is popularly known as foreign aid to the governments of several countries whose ships are carrying oil and other supplies to Cuba.

How long will it be before the United States puts into effect and enforces a blockade against this traffic?

President Kennedy admits that an embargo on oil to Cuba could be effective. He says:

"There isn't any doubt that over a long period of time that denial of oil would make a difference. To deny the oil would require,

A1300

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 11

of course, a blockade, and a blockade is an act of war, and you should be prepared to go for it.

"I think we indicated last October that in periods where we considered the United States was endangered, we were prepared to go as far as was needed to remove that danger, and we would, of course, be willing always to do so again, if we felt there was a situation which carried with it that kind of danger to the United States."

When the President says that a blockade is an "act of war," does this apply to all forms of blockade? History doesn't support such a broad assertion. In the handbook of law known as *Corpus Juris Secundum*, widely used in America's judicial system, there is a particular reference to what is called a pacific blockade. It is defined as follows:

"The so-called pacific blockade is a means of coercion, ordinarily treated as falling short of war, consisting in the interruption of commercial intercourse with certain ports or coasts of a state to secure redress for an international wrong.

"The accepted position is that pacific blockades should not bear on third states except as they are affected by the constraint directly applied to the port or ports blockaded."

Whether a pacific blockade might eventually develop into an acknowledged state of war is hardly relevant, since, realistically speaking, there has been and still continues to be a state of war between Cuba and the United States. The Soviet Union has been proved conclusively to be a military partner of the Cuban Government. The whole world knows that offensive armament intended for a potential attack on the United States was set up in Cuba by the Soviets and that at least 17,000 troops and technicians were brought there from Eastern Europe to man the apparatus.

On the same day—March 6—that the President at his news conference was promising to take action if the Cuban situation became dangerous again, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, head of U.S. Army Intelligence, was testifying before a Senate subcommittee, as follows:

"From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is considerable activity in connection with underground installations throughout the island.

"There are several thousand caves in Cuba and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large and delicate electronic items."

General Fitch described the various kinds of tanks, artillery mortars, rocket launchers, and ground-to-ground missiles in Cuba today, and then declared:

"With the introduction of this equipment into Cuba, the potential firepower and mobility of ground forces has been increased considerably. No nuclear warheads are believed to be in Cuba although it is possible that they could be used by some of the weapons systems present there."

Why then do we quibble over the technicalities of international law as we observe an obvious enemy building a military machine 90 miles away from our shores with the unquestioned purpose of endangering the people of the United States?

Why should Congress continue to vote money to the government of any country whose ships carry oil and other goods to strengthen Castro's position?

Why should the United States hesitate to impose a pacific blockade which will not interfere in any trade operations of the Soviet Union or its satellites with other parts of the world, but will effectively place a boycott on all commerce with Cuba?

We imposed a quarantine last autumn and intercepted Soviet as well as other ships in the Atlantic as they approached Cuba. If we had a right to do this then, we have the right today to put into effect a pacific blockade so as to protect and defend the people of the United States and other peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

Chemists' Magazine Reports New Detergent That Cleans as Well Without Polluting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4571, to end detergent pollution of the Nation's streams and water table would require manufacturers to stop using the chemical that is now the key ingredient in most synthetic detergents.

The choice of a substitute will be up to private industry within the bounds set by standards of decomposability to be established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The availability of a substitute that is reportedly comparable to the products now in use in its cleaning ability but unlike them in that it is full decomposable has been reported in a recent article in *Chemical and Engineering News*. American research may be able to develop an even better substitute for the present perpetually foaming product. The imposition of a reasonable deadline will spur such efforts.

The report on the new biodegradable detergent follows:

GERMAN FIRM DEVELOPS NEW SYNDETS

West Germany's detergent sweepstakes, sparked by a law forbidding sale after October 1, 1964, of products that aren't at least 80-percent biodegradable, has another entry. A new group of nonionic detergents claimed to be 100-percent biodegradable has been unveiled by H. J. Zimmer Verfahrenstechnik, a chemical research and development firm located in Frankfurt, West Germany (*Chemical and Engineering News*, Feb. 18, p. 49).

The products are sugar esters of hydroxy fatty acids. The group currently numbers four and includes the sugar esters of ricinoleic acid, and mono-, di-, and trihydroxystearic acids.

In addition to being biodegradable, the new detergents are low-foaming, nontoxic, and stand on a relatively cheap and available raw material base—sugar and natural oils. And their detergent activity compares well with that of tetrapropylene benzene sulfonate (Tpbs). Tpbs is Germany's biggest selling detergent, has about 85 percent of the market. But it's only about 25-percent degradable, hence will be barred by the Federal Republic's detergent law.

Producers scrambling: Detergent producers and process developers are currently scrambling for substitute products that will meet the 80-percent degradability requirement (*Chemical and Engineering News*, Feb. 18, p. 85). At stake is a detergent market in West Germany that's estimated currently at about 100,000 metric tons a year, or about \$25 million.

The key to the washing ability of the new products is the hydroxyl group, according to Dr. Herbert Simonis, technical manager of Zimmer's purification process methods affiliate and coinventor of the detergents with Dr. Mohammed Ismail, also of Zimmer. The sugar ester of stearic acid, for example, has practically no washing activity, he points out. However, at least one hydroxyl group on the fatty acid chain raises washing ability to competitive levels. Optimum washing properties seem to lie between monohydroxy- and dihydroxystearic acids.

The four sugar esters have similar properties. Special raw material or market conditions would determine which would be produced, Dr. Simonis says. The sugar ester of ricinoleic acid is cheapest to make. But superiorities of other members of the group in certain specific properties might make them more suitable for higher value washing products.

In cost, the new products don't score quite so high. Zimmer figures production cost at about 23 cents per pound of sugar ester. This is about twice that of Tpbs. But the amount of detergent in commercial consumer washing products is only about 2 percent according to Dr. Simonis. The balance is filler and various additives. In industrial detergent products, the detergent fraction might rise to 10 to 20 percent, he says. So, on a final product basis, Dr. Simonis estimates that Zimmer's sugar esters will only be 10 to 15 percent higher in cost than Tpbs.

Will license: Zimmer, which is not a chemical producer, is aiming at licensing the process that it has developed for making the detergents. It is currently negotiating with several companies, including one U.S. firm.

The firm isn't ready to talk process details publicly yet. However, it has roughed out the general scheme, which involves a two-step reesterification of sugar and fatty acids from natural oils. First, fatty acids from raw castor oil or other natural oils are reacted with a low-boiling alcohol such as methanol or ethanol. Then the resulting ester is reacted with sugar to give the sugar ester. Actually, a mixture of about 75-percent monoester and 25-percent diester results, but it can be used as such and needn't be purified. The process is rather simple, Dr. Simonis says, doesn't require special equipment, and in many cases can probably be run in existing plant equipment. Further unpurified raw materials can be used.

Zimmer has tested a number of natural sugars, finds that cheap cane sugar (sucrose) is best. Others can be used, but they cost more and have no special advantage, Dr. Simonis says. Various natural oils that give fatty acids having at least one hydroxyl group, or that can be hydroxylated by hydrogen peroxide or peracetic acid, can be used.

After finding that the sugar ester of ricinoleic acid (from castor oil) is degradable and has good detergent qualities, the firm's research group prepared the sugar esters of mono-, di-, and trihydroxystearic acid for comparison. These turned out to be comparable to the ricinoleic acid sugar ester, but need more processing, are more costly.

Tests made: So far, Zimmer hasn't tested its detergents in large-scale sewage treatment plants. However, it has had tests made by two independent university authorities. Dr. H. Schlegel, director of the Institute for Microbiology of the University of Goettingen, has tested them for microbiological properties, found them not toxic and degradable by bacteria normally found in sewage.

Dr. Herbert Koelbel, rector of the Technical University of Berlin, checked out detergent characteristics. He found that all four esters foam less than Tpbs. At the same time, they lower surface tension by at least

as they in turn affect our internal welfare.

This opinion is shared by many people in and out of the Congress, and it is hoped, therefore, that for the good of this Nation and the good of the State Department the problems can be reviewed and aired in order that there may be a complete understanding among the State Department, the Members of Congress, and the citizens of this country.

ABCD Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1963, Postmaster General J. Edward Day inaugurated a new major postal service innovation—ABCD, standing for accelerated business collections and delivery—in the Washington metropolitan area.

This new service will provide 4-hour delivery of local first-class mail in the downtown business area from Monday through Friday. By the end of this calendar year 273 cities in this country will have the advantages of accelerated business collections and delivery service, a step forward in mail service comparable in importance to the start of free city delivery a century ago.

In launching the accelerated business collections and delivery service here in Washington, Postmaster General Day paid richly deserved credit to the architect of this innovation in mail service, Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen, by presenting him with the Post Office Department's first annual Benjamin Franklin Award.

As head of the vitally important Bureau of Operations of the Post Office Department for the past 2 years, Mr. Belen is publicly credited with an impressive record of accomplishments that have resulted in numerous major improvements of national significance in the Post Office Department. His imaginative and dynamic approach to problems that have long beset the Postal Establishment has brought about improved efficiency, lower cost, and, most important, better service. He has played a major role in developing a number of progressive programs, similar to accelerated business collections and delivery designed to maintain our postal service as the most modern and efficient in the world.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in the tribute paid to Mr. Belen by Postmaster General Day, which follows:

EXCERPT FROM THE ADDRESS BY J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER GENERAL

Introduction of the accelerated business collections and delivery program here in the Washington area provides an ideal oc-

casion for special recognition of the architect of this very successful program of 4-hour business mail service.

It is my genuine pleasure to honor Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen as the first Post Office Department official to receive the Department's esteemed Benjamin Franklin Award.

The Benjamin Franklin Award is a new top honor award of the Department reserved for officials in noncareer positions whose outstanding leadership and accomplishments have resulted in major improvements of national significance in the work of the postal service.

I am rather unusual among Postmasters General, because I have never been national chairman of my party or even particularly active in politics at all. In fact, when President Kennedy announced my appointment—as the first Cabinet member ever from Southern California—he emphasized that it was not because of my very incidental past political activity but because of my management experience, in State government and in business.

I was associated for a number of years with one of the largest and finest law firms in the country. After that I was a senior officer for 8 years of a giant insurance company which is the third largest private corporation in the world.

And yet I can state unequivocally that I have never been surrounded with such talent as I am right now that I am serving in the Federal Government. Every day I work with Federal executives who demonstrate superb imagination, energy, good judgment and practical idealism. With few exceptions I have found that the Federal executive sees himself in context with the great complicated world we live in, he has a lively interest in new ideas and in wider horizons—and he does not take himself too seriously.

Fred Belen has all these qualities. He has been Assistant Postmaster General heading the Department's key Bureau of Operations since the beginning of President Kennedy's administration and for the past 8 months he has additionally carried, with distinction, many of the responsibilities of the Office of Deputy Postmaster General.

Before assuming his present post in January 1961, Mr. Belen had been Counsel and Chief Counsel of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for 14 years and was already widely acknowledged as one of the Nation's foremost authorities on postal administration.

In developing and spearheading major programs of service improvement and economy, Mr. Belen has brought imaginative new approaches to the solution of longstanding problems of the postal service. Accelerated business collections and deliveries is but one example.

He has shown outstanding leadership in enlisting the cooperation of the Nation's large volume business mailers, and has demonstrated that such cooperation benefits both the mailer and the Department.

He has provided expert and energetic direction to the Post Office programs of cost reduction and management improvement, giving concrete expression to the President's goals of economy and manpower utilization. He has been a major contributor at the executive level to the Department's accomplishments in holding to a minimum manpower increases in the postal service, in the reduction of Christmas temporary employees from 295,000 in 1960 to approximately one-half that number in 1962, in the return of \$37 million of our Department appropriation to the Treasury in fiscal 1962, and in the Department's capacity to absorb this year \$40 million of the recent postal employee pay increase.

Mr. Belen first inaugurated the accelerated business collection and delivery program on a pilot basis last August 14 in his home city of Lansing, Mich.

In designating Frederick C. Belen as the first official to be honored with the Benjamin Franklin Award, I am proud to recognize Mr. Belen's exceptional contributions to the operation of the postal service. I now present to him this beautiful plaque of unusual three-dimensional design featuring an inset bust of the first Postmaster General, Benjamin Franklin, and a genuine specimen of the very first postage stamp issued by the U.S. Government—in 1847.

The stamp carries Benjamin Franklin's portrait—and it is interesting to note that it is a 5-cent stamp.

Inquiries: Democrats Handcuff GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the battle to bring about a better balance between minority and majority staff members on congressional committees is beginning to get backing at the grassroots level. As a case in point I offer an editorial from the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times, of February 23, entitled "Inquiries: Democrats Handcuff GOP." Under leave to extend my remarks, I request that this editorial appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

INQUIRIES: DEMOCRATS HANDCUFF GOP

Representative FRED SCHWENGEL and those associated with him in the demand for the Republican right to appoint 40 percent of staffs of House committees are so right that its denial is nothing less than a ruthless power play by Democrats.

Actually, the proposal is so fair that it lost by only 1 vote, 10 to 9, in the House Administration Committee.

Democrats in the House are leery of investigations, a major reason for holding the overwhelming number of investigators under their thumbs.

The inquiries which are apt to engage attention of committees extend into the labyrinth of Federal-State appropriations, particularly into the use of funds for Federal highway construction.

In Massachusetts, for instance, that type of scandal has wider ramifications touching figures whose reputations are of concern to party colleagues.

In other States, inquiries have suddenly been dropped at times, Republicans say as pay dirt appeared on the horizon.

The liberal Washington Post, supporter generally of the Kennedy administration, says editorially:

"Representative SCHWENGEL has estimated that fewer than 50 of about 500 committee employees are Republicans.

"It does not follow, however, that the other 450 are Democrats.

"In many cases where appointments have been made on merit, the political affiliations of the employees are not known and are of no significance, and this is as it should be.

"The professional employees ought to be available to serve the minority as well as the majority, with the object of advancing the

March 11

work of the committee and not of merely making political hay."

The Washington newspaper must expect its readers to be naive to swallow the defense it presents for the failure to give Republicans enough staff members to bring about some semblance of adequate personnel for their committee work.

The Republicans ask 40 percent of the 500 staff members which is certainly a reasonable proportion based upon Republican representation in Congress.

And the idea that professional staff members do not know the Democrats are their bosses and do not carry out their bosses' will is too foolish for argument.

The Washington Post's statement that "it does not follow that the other 450 are Democrats" would bring questioning from Democratic Members of the House if they did not feel that this large group is Democratic enough to hold its place on the Federal payroll.

We Cannot Abandon Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, from the White House "command post" a concerted barrage of propaganda is being aimed at anyone—Republican or Democrat—who dares to criticize the Kennedy record of inaction with regard to Cuba.

As one who has been subjected to such criticism, I find consolation in noting the criticism of the administration's myopic attitude toward the Monroe Doctrine by none other than former President Harry S. Truman. As a historian and rugged individualist, Mr. Truman recognizes the peril of the present situation. I commend him for his strong call for action.

I ask unanimous consent to include as a portion of my remarks the article entitled "We Cannot Abandon Cuba," which appeared in the New York Standard on Sunday, February 24, 1963.

The article follows:

[From the New York Standard, Feb. 24, 1963]

WE CANNOT ABANDON CUBA

(By Harry S. Truman)

Along with everyone else, I have been concerned about the situation in Cuba. The Cuban people have been beset with internal problems almost from the time Cuba was discovered by Columbus. One set of tyrants seems to be succeeded by another in guile of liberators.

There is now much talk about Cuba. There are those who read and talk about it—and there are those who tell those in charge what to do and how to do it. That is all right, as far as it goes, but it does no good and could do much harm, if we get into a political hassle about it. Foreign policy should never be an issue between the great political parties.

Is there no hope for Cuba? Is Cuba now doomed to become the Balkan satellite of the American continent? These and many other questions are being raised.

The one thing that history teaches us over and over again is that no system of govern-

ment that defies the will of its people can long endure and, while modern weapons in the hands of a new crop of quislings make the task of liberation more formidable, it is as true today as it ever was that the will of a people to be free is irresistible. Any government that imposes its will from the top will be overthrown in time. When the people reach that certain point of loss of patience and the congelment of their will to resist they strike back with the savage fury of bloody revolution, resulting in more cruelties in the name of the revolution.

We have always been sympathetic toward the Cuban people but for one reason or another, things never seemed to work out so that the affairs of Cuba could be administered by honest and devoted patriots, rather than the greedy, selfish, grafting dictators that kept succeeding one another.

The present situation in Cuba defies all reasoning. Castro as a revolutionary leader fighting to unseat Dictator Batista attracted sympathetic support from many quarters in this hemisphere, and from the United States in particular. There was some reason to hope that here at long last there may have arisen a true patriot and able leader, who would devote his energies to the establishment of representative government, and put through necessary reforms for the benefit of all the Cuban people.

But, again, our hopes were doomed to disappointment. The man, Castro, became inflated and power mad—and incapable of the kind of leadership Cuba needed in her period of reconstruction.

Instead of applying his energies to the solution of the needs of Cuba, Castro betrayed his revolution by delivering the Cuban people to the political imprisonment of a Russian-made Communist dictatorship. He thus committed Cuba to a life of crisis, of aggression, oppression, and intrigue.

We admit that our policies toward Cuba, and I would include my own administration as well, have left something to be desired. For some reason we have put off for too long our responsibility to put pressure on the Cuban leaders to institute badly needed reforms.

There is one thing we cannot do and must not do and that is to abandon Cuba to her self-imposed tyrants and new conquerors. For as long as these people enforce their will by the use of modern weapons, the Cuban people will be compelled to undergo prolonged suffering, before they can hope to restore themselves by the process of spontaneous popular uprising.

The Cuban situation is in a different category and should not be confused with the other satellite victims within the Russian-Chinese orbit. Cuba was delivered to Communist control and domination by a betrayal of a modern-day Quisling, Castro. He perpetrated this act of treason against the Cuban people and even those of his revolutionary followers, in the name of liberation from colonialism.

I think that it is well that we take a look at the record of our past relations with Cuba. From early 1899 to mid 1902, while Cuba was under temporary U.S. military rule, following her liberation from Spain, most of the offices were placed under Cuban nationals. During that period much was done to build public works; strict measures of sanitation were put into effect; the civil service was reformed; and public education significantly improved. Yellow fever, which had been plaguing Cuba for centuries, was eradicated.

At the same time a constitutional convention was called to establish a system for self-government. The first Cuban Continental Congress met on May 5, 1902, and we turned over control of the Government to the people of Cuba.

In restoring Cuba to self-government the so-called Platt amendment was accepted by Cuba on June 12, 1901, as a part of its Constitution.

Among the several provisions of the Platt amendment were these:

"The sanitation measures set up by the military, were to be maintained;

"Naval stations authorized to be leased to the United States; and

"The United States reserved the right to interfere in the affairs of the island if it became necessary."

It seems to me, that when it appeared that the situation in Cuba was getting out of hand, and that a threat to the security of this hemisphere was clearly in the making, that we should have considered that the basic implications of the Monroe Doctrine were at stake, as well as the reservation imposed by the Platt amendment, which anticipated precisely such a development.

These provisions, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Platt amendment, were there as much for the welfare and protection of Cuba, as for the security of all the other nations of this continent.

The situation is clear, the problem is obvious, the solution not so apparent. But, like the bubonic plague or cholera, quarantining is one remedy that every public health authority knows must be imposed until a virulent epidemic abates.

A former President, much as he might try, cannot detach himself from events, even long after he is out of office. On one of my walks, a speculative thought kept going through my mind on how I might have dealt with Castro if it had been mine to do. This is how I saw it: Immediately after the conclusion of the revolution in Cuba, I would have invited Castro to the White House. This is the way I might have put it to him:

"Mr. Castro, your revolution is over and now you have the responsibility and the big job of reconstruction. You have made a great many promises to your people in enlisting their support. How are you going to make good in those promises? You don't have the resources of your own in Cuba, and there are no means in sight to enable you to perform the things you promised the Cuban people.

"Now, there are only two places where you might get the necessary economic support to put over your program of reforms. We are close to Cuba and we have historic ties with your country. All we would expect in return for our support would be that you keep the Cuban institutions free, and the Cuban people free, and that you get rid of corruption. This is all we would ask, this is all we would expect, and Cuba would enjoy complete sovereignty and independence as a nation. But if you should elect to go the other way—the Communist way—you will become a puppet and that can only lead you to more trouble and bloodshed."

I would have hoped that after some such exchange we should have come to an understanding and I think we might have reached a friendly agreement. All this, of course, needed to have been quietly negotiated within the privacy of the White House. With that out of the way I might have closed our meeting with a friendly suggestion, perhaps something like this:

"Now that we understand each other, Fidel, let us get to work and do all we can for the cause of your people."

The Cuban crisis has served one useful purpose—it again smoked out the Russian capacity for bluff and their "hit and run" type of international piracy. And it provided the United States with an opportunity to make it clear to the Communist aggressors that once the line is drawn we stand firm.

1963

ernment felt it owed the cotton farmer something, that they should pay it to him and not try to make the market pay it, because the market would not do it for long, and in the end, if we followed that road, the United States would lose its cotton supremacy. One other man supported me. His name was Thompson, and he was an official of the Texas Cotton Ginners' Association.

But our voices were like one crying in the wilderness.

At that time, the Civil War psychology still persisted that cotton was king in America. The United States produced more cotton than all the rest of the world put together. We produced then 14½ million bales for consumption. We are producing the same amount today, but a sizable quantity goes in the Government loan.

In these 30 years, foreign free world production has increased from 8½ million bales to 21 million bales. If we included Russia and China, the increase is even greater.

As Dr. Horne has shown, synthetics have increased greatly.

Obviously, some of this accelerated growth in foreign cotton and in synthetics would have taken place in any case. To me, however, the most frightening aspect of our present situation in cotton is the fact that we are losing markets at home and abroad, while foreign cotton and synthetics are both going down in price and up in use.

For the 10 years prior to the meeting in Washington in June 1933, the average of our cotton exports was 7,880,000 bales. The average for the past 10 years is 4,732,000 bales. In these 30 years, we have lost over 3 million bales per year in exports of cotton.

What can be done now to save our raw cotton industry?

I don't pretend to know all the answers, but I believe I know some of them.

Obviously, U.S. cotton's principal competitors are foreign cottons and synthetics, both of which operate in a free market. The greatest service of the free market is the automatic selection of the most efficient means of production.

World commodities, like coffee, cotton, sugar, wheat, et cetera, produced for export, cannot be sheltered from world competition. Even for domestic consumption, every commodity has its competitors.

If our cotton is to regain its rightful position in the domestic and world markets, then the U.S. Government must restore cotton to a free market. Reducing the price is not enough. Does any man in this room imagine that any bureau in Washington knows what the price of any world commodity, such as cotton, should be? The answer to this question is to be found in the record of Government price fixing for these past 30 years. Just look at the record of the two-price system on cotton. The United States, a number of years ago, officially branded such system as "dumping," and now at a time when the rest of the industrialized free world is moving in the opposite direction, we engage in this system, not only for cotton but for other commodities. Among other faults, this two-price system on cotton lays a wholly unfair and indefensible burden on our cotton textile mills in allowing their foreign competitors in the domestic goods market to acquire their raw material, even U.S.-grown cotton, at 8½ cents per pound less than the U.S. mill must pay.

In my opinion, nothing but a return to the free market will save our U.S. raw cotton trade. Nevertheless, under Government control these past 30 years, we have gone so far in the destruction of this trade that there certainly will be a period during a shift back to farmer control when cotton farmers will need help. It is believed that this period will not last more than 5 years

and will cost our taxpayers much less than the present dollar cost of Government control of cotton, to say nothing of the loss of our cotton business due to such control.

As Dr. Horne has indicated, U.S. cotton is fighting a desperate battle for survival. I want to add that it is fighting this battle with both hands tied behind its back so long as the Government continues control of cotton production and of the cotton market.

Flood Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Sevier County News-Record on Thursday, March 7, 1963, regarding the devastating flood which swept into Sevierville and Sevier County last Tuesday night and Wednesday morning, March 5 and 6.

Many homes in the Love Addition and on Riverside Drive of Sevier County had to be evacuated, and merchants of downtown Sevierville worked throughout the night setting up barricades in efforts to keep water out of their stores. Court Avenue in Sevierville was a thoroughfare for boats Wednesday morning as floodwaters from the Pigeon River covered the heart of the town entering many of the business establishments and causing widespread damage.

Mr. Bo Roberts, editor, and Mr. William C. Postlewaite, publisher, of the Sevier County News-Record, are to be congratulated on the fine coverage of this flood and for presenting a word and picture story of the flood, pinpointing the desperate need for flood relief. I thought it was so good that I would like to make it available to the other Members of Congress.

The article follows:

FLOOD AGAIN

(By Bo Roberts)

High waters swept into Sevierville early Wednesday morning causing a flood in the downtown and some residential sections at least greater than the one in December of 1961 and possibly as large as the one in 1957.

There has been a lot of talk, but very little action taken since the 1961 flood, and it seems many area citizens are wanting to get something done. Thousands of dollars of damages have again been caused, even though many persons had 6 or 7 hours to prepare for the flood. The next flood could be years away . . . of it could be next week . . . it is high time action is taken on the part of local, State, and Federal officials to see that something is done to stop this costly and dangerous flooding.

There have been no reported casualties, but many homes in the Love Addition and on Riverside Drive have had to be evacuated. Merchants in downtown Sevierville worked throughout the night setting up barricades in efforts to keep water out of their stores. Water is reported to have gotten into several businesses in spite of their efforts.

Veteran observers of floods here were di-

vided on whether Wednesday's flood was larger than the 1957 flood or not, but in any event it was another costly bit of high water.

Some 3.5 inches of rain fell Tuesday, coupled with melting snow from the mountains; this sent both prongs of the Little Pigeon River rising rapidly. The first signs of overflowing came at about midnight, and then at about 1 a.m. the water started rising rapidly. It reached its crest about 6 or 6:30 a.m. Wednesday and started to fall shortly thereafter. Some Knoxville-Sevierville traffic was open shortly after 9 a.m.

Homeowners and businessmen now face the task of cleaning up, another costly operation.

The Sevier County Volunteer Rescue Squad was on the scene all night Tuesday, aiding in the evacuation of homes and serving in many helpful capacities. Also on extra duty were the Sevierville police and the Sevierville Volunteer Fire Department.

No details were available at press time as to the total amount of damage.

Now is the time to get something done about this situation; we shouldn't wait until an even larger flood comes and takes several lives.

Improving Medical Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point, an editorial from the Baltimore News-Post of March 4, 1963, titled "Improving Medical Aid," which points up so well certain drawbacks in the administration of the Kerr-Mills program for providing medical care for senior citizens in my State of Maryland.

It is for this reason that I introduced legislation in the House of Representatives, H.R. 4388, to correct this situation and permit the individual States to select the agency to be responsible for medical assistance to the aged, rather than having this program supervised by the State departments of welfare. The editorial is appended at this point and I commend it to the attention of the Congress:

IMPROVING MEDICAL AID

As now administered in Maryland, the Kerr-Mills program for providing medical care for senior citizens is supervised by the State department of welfare and is carried out by local welfare agencies, in Baltimore by the city department of public welfare.

Congressman CHARLES McC. MATHIAS of Maryland's Sixth District has noted that this system has certain drawbacks, principally because applicants for aid must file their applications with the welfare agencies.

"Many people," Congressman MATHIAS points out, "feel that there is a certain stigma to making applications for welfare aid. This objection has some basis in fact because those who receive medical aid through the welfare department may not otherwise be needful of welfare assistance."

To correct this situation, Congressman MATHIAS has introduced in Congress a bill which would change the Kerr-Mills provision by permitting individual States to select the agency which would be responsible for medical assistance to the aged.

A1292

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 11

Advocates of the Kerr-Mills program agree that it can be improved. Congressman MATTHIAS' proposed legislation is one way to achieve improvement. His bill should receive full congressional support.

Soviet Bombers—How?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a most disturbing revelation has been made by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott in yesterday's Long Island Press. It concerns Soviet bombers flying over several of our aircraft carriers.

I wonder if President Kennedy will also consider these bombers as defensive?

The article follows:

SOVIET BOMBERS KNEW JUST WHERE U.S. CARRIERS WERE

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Defense Secretary McNamara's delayed disclosure of those Russian reconnaissance-bomber flights over four U.S. carriers is only part of this jolting story.

What the at-times-circuitous Pentagon boss didn't reveal is even more significant than what he finally did make known.

For security reasons most of these chilling untold facts cannot be divulged as yet. They are still tightly classified—although, of course, no secret to the Russians; only to Americans.

But it is possible to publish the following extremely important information that McNamara withheld:

In each of these ominous carrier overflights the Soviet reconnaissance-bombers flew direct to their midocean "targets" by the shortest circular routes from bases in Russia. The giant Red planes (known in the West as Bears) did not search for the carriers. They set courses straight for them and flew over them.

Such extraordinary bull's-eye flying, as it is being termed by members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is possible only in two ways, as follows:

Possession by the Russians of a secret space (satellite) or other high level reconnaissance system that enables the detection and tracking of ships.

Advance Soviet knowledge of the exact location and courses of the four carriers—the *Enterprise*, *Forrestal*, *Kitty Hawk*, and *Princeton*.

Military authorities are convinced the former is the case.

These highly revealing incidents confirm for them a growing belief they have had for some time that the Russians have in orbit one or more reconnaissance satellites with the same capabilities as our very secret *Samos* and *Ferret*.

These U.S. satellites take photographs and monitor communications. The Air Force has at least six *Samos*es in orbit from 150 to 300 miles above the earth. These satellites snap pictures of Russian areas and installations and transmit them to ground receiving stations. The *Ferret*, in addition to being equipped with a camera similar to those in the *Samos*, has a complex electronic system for monitoring communications.

Both the *Samos* and *Ferret* can take photos at heights of several hundred miles from which individuals on the ground can be identified.

Strikingly indicative of the high degree of effectiveness of the Reds' detection and tracking system are the following grim details about which Secretary McNamara was characteristically vague:

The Navy reported that the Bear reconnaissance-bomber that flew over the 75,000-ton *Forrestal* southeast of the Azores on February 22 was tracked some 2,100 miles from a base in northeastern Russia. From the very start the Soviet plane made a beeline for the carrier and flew directly to it by the shortest circular route.

Throughout, the intruding Bear was under surveillance, either by radar, radio, or by plane. Two *Ferret* satellites were tuned in on the Russians. What was learned is classified.

For two brief periods radar lost its "loc" on the Soviet plane. This was done to the Reds' using a new type of metal chaff that temporarily blotted out radar contact. But surveillance was maintained through other methods, and interceptors of the *Forrestal* were in the air long before the Bear hove into sight.

However, intelligence experts point out that is not as important as it may appear to be.

They cite the fact that the Bear has the capability of being armed with a known Soviet air-to-ground missile that can be launched some 650 miles from a carrier—definitely out of the range of U.S. carrier-based interceptors.

One Navy report on the incidents—also not mentioned by McNamara—stated that a Bear that overflew a carrier was equipped with racks that could have carried nuclear bombs of more than 20 megatons. Photos were taken of this Communist plane showing these bomb racks.

An intelligence report stressed the point that, in direct contrast to these bullseye overflights, it took the Navy 4 days to locate that hijacked Venezuelan freighter.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, had much to do with forcing disclosure of these sinister overflights. He questioned McNamara about the *Kitty Hawk* incident during the latter's closed-door appearance before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Obviously startled and disconcerted, McNamara admitted the accuracy of Goldwater's information.

Later, after conferring with the President, the defense chief hurriedly summoned a press conference and announced the overflights.

An Example of Individual Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, throughout our great country silent benefactors play vital roles in countless small communities such as my hometown of Russell, Kans.

Russell, and in fact all of Russell County, Kans., lost a true friend in the death of W. H. "Bill" Sellens on February 10, 1963. Blessed with a degree of material wealth Mr. Sellens firmly believed in community betterment and practiced this belief in individual responsibility for many, many years.

There are countless examples bearing the stamp of his generosity in our community but perhaps his greatest pride

was in doing his bit to insure first class medical treatment for the patients and first class facilities for the staff of Russell City Hospital. I share with you a letter written by Dr. M. E. Schulz, Mr. Sellens' physician for many years, to the Russell Daily News:

YOUR HOSPITAL AND BILL SELLENS

In January 1963, your hospital was 20 years old. For the past 12 years, Mr. Bill Sellens has been the greatest benefactor of this community institution for healing the sick. Through his generosity, your hospital has been made a better place in which to care for the sick, and has been kept modern in every respect.

Each and every one of us should be particularly grateful for this man. He was truly a pioneer of Russell County and expressed many times that the good Lord was kind to him, and he wished to return this kindness to his home community. This is something that many of us should think about, for it is our home community which is important, for it is where we live and where we die. Mr. Sellens was a God-fearing man, who in the early days quarried our famous stone posts, at the price of 10 cents apiece. He was a very humble man and truly left his community in a better condition than when he found it. He had many friends. He was a towering man, well above 6 feet in height, and distinguished in his actions. He gave to the youth in many ways, as he was always interested in our children. This kind of citizen is a citizen worth writing about. He believed in self-determination and individual responsibilities. He not only spoke of individual initiative, but he practiced it.

Here are some of the things that your hospital would not be blessed with had it not been for gifts over the past 12 years from Bill Sellens: the professional staff library, many room furnishings, solarium furnishings, laboratory equipment, two different sets of new X-ray equipment, air conditioning, the doctors' call system, and many other things.

It has been said that there is always a woman behind every man's actions. The above comments could not have been said were it not for the very able Mrs. Amelia Sellens, wife of Mr. Bill Sellens, and it is trite to say that these things could have been done only with her full cooperation.

Activities of the Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, at another point in the Record today, Congressman DON L. SHORT is including in his remarks, House Joint Resolution Q-1, passed by both houses of the North Dakota State Legislature without a dissenting vote.

The resolution requests Congress to investigate and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the Department of State. In other words it calls for an investigation of the activities of the State Department as it relates to our foreign policies

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1289

How have we responded to your appeals? Let me answer the question this way. The Chinese Communists persecuted and imprisoned Bishop Cuthbert O'Gara. When they finally expelled him from China, he hoped to arouse American Catholics to the sufferings of their brother Catholics in China. How did we answer his appeal? By and large we ignored him. Bishop O'Gara said it was easier to bear Communist persecution than the indifference of American Catholics. We have done very little to help our brother Catholics who suffer Communist persecution. We forget that it is Christ himself whom they persecute. What will we Latin Catholics say to Jesus Christ our Judge when He asks us at the judgment, "I was persecuted, and what did you do to help Me?"

We cannot rely on the U.S. Government to do this job for us. The U.S. Government plainly showed its attitude toward those suffering Communist persecution when the U.S. Embassy in Moscow shut its door in the face of those Russian Baptists who asked for asylum in the name of Jesus Christ. Further, the U.S. Government has completely abandoned any idea of supporting a liberation movement against the Communists. Not only that, but the United States has abandoned the Monroe Doctrine and has consented to the maintenance of a Communist slave state in Cuba, 90 miles off our shores. Furthermore, the United States has adopted a policy of peaceful coexistence with the Communist empire. And now the U.S. Government is disarming in the face of the Communist enemy; witness the abandonment of planning and production of advanced nuclear bombers, the RS-70 program; witness the abandonment of the Skybolt nuclear bomber missile; the abandonment of nuclear missile bases around Russia; and the recall of our nuclear bombers from bases around Russia. Our Government is not only willing to settle for things the way they are now, but is disarming to prevent even any threat to the Communists. We cannot count on the U.S. Government to help those suffering Communist persecution. The U.S. Government does not want to embarrass the Communists.

But what can we do? We can do a great deal. We can pray. Does that sound like a truism? About 1 year ago the Ukrainian Catholic bishops here in the United States called a press conference to spotlight the sufferings of Archbishop Slipy in his Communist prison. Here in Omaha, our beloved archbishop, the Most Reverend Gerald T. Bergan, called upon us to pray for those suffering Communist persecution. I am sure many American bishops did likewise. Today on this, his 71st birthday, Archbishop Slipy is a free man. If it is a holy and wholesome thing to pray for the dead, how much more holy and wholesome it must be to pray for those suffering persecution for Christ. Those who suffer persecution have first call on the charity of our prayers.

Secondly, we can and should constantly remind our fellow Americans and our Government of the persecution which our brothers are suffering from the Communists. There is hardly an issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which does not carry articles about the persecution of the Jews in Russia. The Communists do not generally kill Jews—they pressure them. They close some of their synagogues; they restrict the publication of Jewish religious books; they obstruct the training of rabbis; they give the Jews adverse publicity; they make it difficult for Jews to get a professional education. My friends, you and I know that the Communists have treated the Jews mildly in comparison to their treatment of Ukrainian Catholics. The Communists have made a determined effort to suppress catholicism completely among Ukrainians.

Our Jewish friends are telling their story. We Latin Catholics are not telling the story of our persecuted brothers. You would think the silent church is on this side of the Atlantic. We can and should make the sufferings of our fellow Catholics known. We Latin Catholics must cooperate with you Byzantine Catholics to tell the world of Communist persecution. Then maybe our Government will exert itself to alleviate the sufferings of our brothers in Christ.

Archbishop Slipy symbolizes the fidelity of the Ukrainian people to Christ in the face of Communist persecution. That is the reason we honor him. We can honor him best by loving Our Lord Jesus Christ as Archbishop Slipy has loved him. We can love Our Lord by working and praying for our brother Catholics who are suffering Communist persecution. That is the message of the archbishop's release. The warning is that if we fail to love Our Lord as we should we may soon suffer persecutions ourselves.

Just as God has released Archbishop Slipy from a Communist concentration camp, so one day God will free the Ukrainian people and all other people from Communist slavery. Let us praise and thank God for His goodness, and pray and work together for that glorious day.

Thank you.

Housing Utopia Is Fine, but Where's the Cash?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial which appeared on March 6 in the Daily Intelligencer, a newspaper published in Doylestown, Bucks County, Pa. The said editorial goes right to the heart of one of the problems which is presently confronting us:

HOUSING UTOPIA IS FINE, BUT WHERE'S THE CASH?

We need the stout advocates of principle at both ends of the political spectrum. They sharpen public debate on the great issues and serve as a useful check on too precipitate Government action.

But it does not follow from this that those who stand for principle are of necessity braver and more useful than those who occupy the compromising political center.

The National Housing Conference, a 32-year-old organization devoted to eliminating slums and blight, perhaps illustrated in its newest Washington meeting how easy it is to talk on the side of the angels.

The NHC notes some largely unassailable facts:

Our total annual output of new housing is insufficient to meet the needs of a growing population, especially those in lower- and middle-income groups. We are not getting enough urban renewal and we are getting too much urban and suburban sprawl.

To get more and better housing, to arrest deterioration, wipe out slums and check sprawl, the NHC proposes that the Federal Government quickly approve vast new sums.

Toting up the rough amounts involved in its proposals for expanded urban renewal, low-rent housing, housing for the elderly,

improved rural and farm housing, we attain a figure upward of \$4 billion. A portion would be in loans.

A nonspecialist in housing problems is hardly equipped to question the wisdom of NHC's figures as an ideal proposition.

What the outsider can question, however, is how NHC President Nathaniel Keith and NHC's resolutions committee can discuss these proposals for 21 pages as if not one single other claim on the Federal budget existed.

It is recognized that better housing is just part of a broad attack on poverty. But nowhere are housing's demands on the budget put in a scale of priorities with such other needs as job retraining, improved general education, health, welfare, highways.

Nothing is said of the fact that we must spend some \$55 billion for defense and other sums to aid our friends abroad.

Indeed, NHC says plainly that its proposed bigger housing effort has a "first claim on the resources of our economy." Many Americans had thought that defense requirements enjoy that preeminence.

NHC's goals are fine. But in stating them flat out in a kind of political and economic vacuum, the group has done just the easiest part of the job.

Left to the political engineers who must deal in realities is the task of scaling such propositions to make them fit somewhere in today's baffling array of competing demands.

Truth, Toughness Needed in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House an excellent editorial which appeared in the Ashland Times-Gazette, Ashland, Ohio, written by Robert Beer, publisher of this independent daily newspaper. It focuses attention on the growing grass-roots sentiment regarding bungling policy in the Cuban situation.

I commend this fine editorial to all of the Members of the House:

TRUTH, TOUGHNESS NEEDED IN CUBA

When the arms buildup began in the Florida Keys several months ago this writer pledged to silence his criticism of President Kennedy and to support him in his apparent determination to avert another blunder such as our chickenlivered failure to back up the Bay of Pigs attack. The chance of hot war then became a calculated risk and, at last, our country was to assert its responsibility to its own people and to the other free nations of the hemisphere.

So it seemed.

Fear of the possible consequences of such a firm stand was smothered by a renewed pride and confidence in ourselves and our President. The showdown was at hand—the brave and noble move had been made—someone would be obliged to either fight or lose face before a world audience. Unity among the Americas was at an historic peak—more fierce and abiding than ever. Now there would be a beginning of an end, an end of 20 years on a powder keg while one Republican and three Democratic Presidents watched communism creep its way like molten lava from the Kremlin to the very shores of the United States. The end was in sight.

A1290

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 11

So it seemed.

It was Khrushchev who backed away. He promised to withdraw his service personnel and arms from Cuba. Yes, there would be inspection permitted to assure compliance with this agreement. Yes, the process would start as soon as we relinquished our blockade of the island. What a victory this was for all free countries and the true friends of Uncle Sam. How plain it now was, that the Red plan was based on bluff and arrogance, how wonderful it was that the United States of America had regained its global prestige and was emerging as the savior of democracy and as the acknowledged winner of a bloodless showdown. The insults and threats would be no more.

So it seemed.

Disillusionment by reason of inaction and timidity at the highest Government level is with us again. Alas, more than ever before the feeling of shame and futility is with us. There is apprehension and lost confidence.

Is the next stupid deal with the Soviet to be the abandonment of our Guantanamo Naval Base in return for an exodus of the Russian guests? We anticipate with horror the headline "Castro Stays—Glimo Goes."

For months the Cuban situation has rapidly worsened. It was first denied that 17,000 Russians occupied the island. Administration word declared that the Red missiles were gone, the launching sites destroyed, the evacuation an accomplished fact, the pact with Russia honorably consummated, and the situation again under our control.

This, we now know was utterly false and deliberately misleading.

When the compassionate and levelheaded Jim Bishop, John Knight, and other reputable and distinguished observers have their craws full of managed news releases from the White House it is time to take heed.

The Cuban refugees who were unlawfully ransomed by way of typical Kennedy family manipulation swear that only a few of the really potent attack missiles left Cuba. They maintain that more Russian troops and service personnel are arriving every week—that the huge assault weapons have been transferred to island caves—that Castro is now a confirmed and powerless puppet. Refugees are excitable; these reports may not be true.

Our cursory inspection of the departing ships of U.S.S.R. convinced the brains of Washington that there was full compliance with the arms withdrawal deal that Kennedy made with Khrushchev. Indeed, were not the tarps lifted on one or two of the suggestive missile silhouettes that were observed on the decks of the Russian vessels? Indeed were not the portions of the cargo thus exposed quite similar to the pictures we have seen of Russian rocketry on parade in the streets of Moscow?

Did we board the ships and verify these assumptions? Did we lift the tarpaulin sheaths from the other packages to see if they covered real jet missiles or merely the severed trunks of royal palm trees? Did we inspect the caves, count the Russian guests on the island? Did we insist that Nikita make good his bargain?

We did not.

Furthermore we are still relying on fuzzy pictures made from hedgehopping U.S. planes. We are told by way of the hoodwinked press that such is adequate proof that our doubts are unfounded. Incoming shipments show no rocket contours on the decks * * * again reconnaissance photos, we are told, indicate that a blockade or contact inspection is unwarranted.

Why further provoke or irritate the touchy and honorable Nikita? Why risk another incident?

This editor is not buying such custom-tailored trash and neither is the Washington

press corps, the publishers of our Nation's responsible newspapers, nor a growing number of Members of Senate and House on both sides of the aisles.

While Huntley and Brinkley chuckle about the walking antics of the personable Pierre Salinger—a man who this writer admires and knows in a casual way—an accomplished journalist with an impressive background for faithful dedication to the best interests of the fourth estate—we wonder.

We wonder if it doesn't get awfully oppressive to be on the inside these days. We wonder if even a stout fellow like the able and redoubtable press secretary doesn't often yearn to take a brisk hike into the fresh, open air.

In our opinion he has the most demanding job in Washington.

Praise Given to Bureau of Land Management Administration in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, people generally, and Members of Congress in particular, usually hear only the complaints and criticism that are made about Government agencies. The Bureau of Land Management has been no exception to this general rule.

As a welcome change, there has come to my attention a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Consolidated Wool Growers of Western Colorado, which was held at Hotchkiss, Colo., on February 13, 1963, expressing appreciation to the Bureau of Land Management for its "very good work in administration of the sheep ranges in this district."

In bringing this matter to the attention of the House I would be remiss if I did not mention in passing the cooperative spirit that has been displayed by Mr. Lowell M. Puckett, State Director of the Bureau of Land Management. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the cooperation that Mr. Puckett has given to me and to the people of Colorado.

I compliment the Consolidated Wool Growers for their constructive action in taking note of meritorious service and I include the text of the resolution with my remarks for the information of all Members:

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

At the annual meeting of the Consolidated Wool Growers of Western Colorado the following resolution was passed.

This association wishes to express our appreciation to the Bureau of Land Management for their very good work in administration of the sheep ranges in this district. Their work in range improvement is notable. The development of stock water, in cleaning of useless brush, in reseeding, in fencing along borders of allotments, and for access roads add to practical management which show results in improvement of the range.

Sheep growers know and feel that it is time the public should know the land management is doing all possible within the means they have to develop the potential of public ranges. We feel that in the last

few years, the cooperative agreements have resulted in improved conditions.

Water development, in construction of water ponds has eliminated wasted trailing. The construction of dams has prevented erosion.

The fencing program of the last few years has increased better management and has eliminated damaging duplication of use.

We feel that intelligent training and practical application, and cooperation of users are bringing good results.

Therefore this association wishes to thank the land management and its officers and pledge further cooperation.

D. W. MCINTIRE,
President.

Will Clayton Speaks Out Against Cotton Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Will L. Clayton is well known throughout the Nation for his distinguished service to this country as former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and Assistant Secretary of Commerce. He is known throughout the world for his knowledge of the cotton business, as head of the great international firm of Anderson & Clayton.

I think it would be well for those who are endeavoring to manipulate the U.S. cotton industry to heed the recommendations contained in Mr. Clayton's brief remarks before the National Cotton Council in El Paso last January 28.

So that others interested in U.S. cotton gaining its rightful place in the world market may have an opportunity to read this distinguished statesman's recommendations, I have the privilege of inserting his remarks:

REMARKS OF W. L. CLAYTON AT THE 25TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL, EL PASO, TEX., JANUARY 28, 1963

We are all indebted to Dr. Horne and to Mr. McCord for their lucid exposition of the critical danger the United States faces of losing its raw cotton trade.

I have studied the council pamphlet of September 1962, and I am in complete agreement with Dr. Horne's conclusions, except I go farther than he in fixing the responsibility for this situation and in the steps that must be taken to correct it.

To develop the points I wish to make, I must take you back to an historic meeting I attended in Washington in June 1933, almost 30 years ago.

This meeting was called by the Secretary of Agriculture.

There were about 100 men present, all interested in some aspects of the cotton business.

As I remember it, the telegram calling this meeting was rather vague as to its purpose, but soon after the meeting opened, it was apparent that its purpose was to get the cotton trade to approve a decision already made for the Government to pay farmers to plow up every third row of the growing cotton crop.

I spoke out against this with all the vigor that I could command. I said if the Gov-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1285

stretch and face up to their Pegu-Pyu differences at a later date. Agency for International Development officials want the Pegu-Pyu stretch to follow whichever route is found to be most economical and technically feasible.

MANDALAY—1960 (WITH APOLOGIES TO
RUDYARD KIPLING)

By the old Mulmein Pagoda, lookin' eastward to the sea,
There's a Burma project settin', and I doubt it works for me.
But the White House says we've got to, and the foreign echoes say
Come you back, you Yankee dollar, come you back to Mandalay.

On the road to Mandalay,
Where the ICA'ers play,
Can't you hear their 'dozers chunkin' from Rangoon to Mandalay?
On the road to Mandalay
Just another giveaway
And the dough comes up like thunder from the good old U.S.A.

Bargaining on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 6, 1963.

BARGAINING ON TRIAL

Labor Secretary Wirtz has let it be known that, in his view, collective bargaining is on trial. Labor and management face their "last clear chance" to prove that they can work things out by themselves. If they don't, he strongly implies that the Government stands ready to take over.

Looking around the Nation, it's not hard to find evidence that collective bargaining is indeed in trouble. As Mr. Grimes commented on this page the other day, traditional bargaining procedures lately have proved of little help in the airline, railroad, aerospace, newspaper, and longshore industries.

How did bargaining get in such a bad way? Why is there increasing talk that "something must be done" by Government?

Ironically a large part of the answer is simply that Government has done so much already. Washington proclaims proper wage as well as price behavior. In purported defense of the public interest, Government officials roam the country intervening in labor disputes. Their intervention comes ever earlier, sometimes even before real bargaining has had a chance to begin. And its circle of interest grows ever wider, sweeping in even the Metropolitan Opera.

The more the concept of public interest has been twisted and expanded, the more labor disputes become a matter of public shouting rather than private bargaining. Increasingly, both sides see little reason for flexibility in their dealings with each other. Why should they try to work things out at the bargaining table? The chances are the Government will settle it anyway.

It's true that both sides can still resist Government pressure up to a point. Thus the railway clerks on the Southern Pacific, in their eagerness to preserve featherbedding, feel free to ignore the findings of a Presi-

dential board. And the head of the New York printers' union, denounced by the President, blandly replies that Mr. Kennedy was misinformed.

After all, they have before them the interesting precedent of the longshoremen. When the dockworkers resisted Federal pressure, the Government turned on the employers and in effect forced them to accept a settlement. A settlement, in fact, that went beyond the Government's own wage guidelines.

So it is hardly surprising that the Government, as well as the would-be bargainers, feels a growing sense of frustration. It has stepped in too far and yet the only answer it sees is to get in even deeper. Unless, of course, those directly concerned with collective bargaining should somehow overcome all the Government-imposed obstacles, pull themselves together and regain mastery of their own affairs.

The chances for any such development, in the current circumstances, are dim. For collective bargaining, even before the Government stepped up its intervention, was being called on to accomplish too much. A labor official quoted by Mr. Grimes put it this way: "Collective bargaining was intended to handle specific problems between a specific company and a specific union." Where those conditions still prevail, labor relations are often excellent.

But even a cursory glance at today's America will show how far bargaining generally has departed from the original concept. With their explicit exemption from antimonopoly laws, labor unions over the years have steadily expanded the area of bargaining to a point where negotiators are called upon to set wages and working conditions for employees in a wide variety of plants in a variety of geographical areas, often located throughout the country.

Is this request entirely reasonable? The head of the Steelworkers Union admits to being out of touch with the real wishes of the rank and file, and other national union leaders cannot be much better informed. Yet, on their distant reading of the needs of their members, national unions now can and do close down not just a few plants but whole industries.

In this situation, it is no solution to take the process of wage determination still another long step away from the workers—to entrust the problem to government. That way lies the road to complete economic regimentation, a regimentation that could hardly be expected to stop with wages. Surely it would make more sense to head in the opposite direction, to try to bring about local bargaining in local plants over local issues.

If collective bargaining is indeed on trial, it is government that has largely put it there. And government also must stand in the dock.

Aid to Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, President Kennedy recently submitted to Congress his recommendation that a basic program of hospital insurance for the aged be provided for Americans 65 and over primarily through the social security system. Thirty-five Senators joined me in introducing the Hospital

Insurance Act of 1963. Action on this matter is long overdue. That is the central point of a statement by the AFL-CIO Executive Council published on February 26, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON THE PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL MESSAGE ON AIDING SENIOR CITIZENS, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

For the first time in our history the President of the United States has sent to the Congress a special message on the problems of the aged and aging. The President's program recognizes with fresh perspective and clear vision that old age need not be characterized by anguish, fear and insecurity, that the phrase "the golden years" can indeed become a reality for millions of more Americans, and that the Federal Government has an important role in helping States, local communities, and individual families in bringing this about.

Of course, the first and foremost priority is hospital insurance. As the President so eloquently stated: "A proud and resourceful Nation can no longer ask its older people to live in constant fear of a serious illness for which adequate funds are not available. We owe them the right of dignity in sickness as well as in health. We can achieve this by adding health insurance—primarily hospitalization insurance—to our successful social security system."

The AFL-CIO has called for the enactment of health insurance for the aged through social security and railroad retirement for some years past. Since our early support of such legislation we have witnessed an increasing recognition of the need for action, we have seen legislative proposals revised and modified and we have watched the support of thoughtful citizens and responsible organizations strengthen and grow: In the development of the last several years, these facts stand out:

(1) The aged need health insurance: Health insurance has become the accepted way of paying hospital and other large health bills for the majority of Americans. The increased medical needs that come with old age make payment of major health costs at the time of illness utterly impractical for those living on a retirement income. Health insurance for the aged is imperative.

(2) The type of insurance the aged need most is hospital insurance: The greatest health expenses during old age are associated with hospitalization. A program of benefits emphasizing hospitalization and nursing home care is the most appropriate program for meeting the most urgent needs of the vast majority of the aged.

(3) The only practical way to finance hospital insurance for the aged is based on the social security principle, with benefits: For those people who are not now covered by social security or railroad retirement financed out of general revenues. Our social security system is today serving many millions of Americans in protecting them against loss of income through retirement, disability, or death. Beneficiaries have earned this protection through contributions made during their working lives. Social Security must be extended to protect people against the fourth major threat, the high cost of hospital and related care. Social insurance, enabling people to contribute while they are working toward benefits which they receive as a matter of right at the time of retirement is far superior to a welfare pro-

A1286

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 11

gram. Social insurance prevents poverty and preserves dignity.

(4) Public welfare medical assistance is only acceptable as a second line of defense: While public assistance medical care cannot substitute for social insurance, it can function as a supplement to the basic hospitalization program of social security, just as old-age assistance has supplemented the OASDI system for a quarter of a century. The President answered well those who would rely solely on welfare medical programs instead of social security financed insurance when he so aptly pointed to the weakness of welfare medical assistance as helping people to get health care "only if they first accept poverty and then accept charity."

(5) Private insurance can make a major contribution by supplementing the basic hospitalization plan. We can expect private insurance greatly to expand as it supplements basic hospitalization coverage through social security just as other private insurance grew after the passage of the original Social Security Act.

(6) The time for action is now. We call upon the Congress of the United States to enact a program of hospital insurance for the aged through social security and railroad retirement at this session. Although irresponsible opposition has done all it can to confuse the American people about the issues at stake, the vast majority of Americans young and old, can see through the sloganeering and scare tactics, and will support with enthusiasm the prompt enactment of the administration's sound, practical proposal of hospital insurance for the aged.

While the problem of providing hospital insurance for the aged supersedes all other matters that would improve the lot of the older members of our families, we cannot overlook the special needs of the aged in the areas of housing, income, employment taxes and special facilities and services. We congratulate the administration on the scope of its program for our older citizens and urge the Congress to implement it with prompt action.

Cuban Caves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFOR D. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks now there have been conflicting claims about a Soviet military buildup in Cuba.

In an effort to shed light on this subject, my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] made a statement on the House floor February 28. This statement largely consisted of material obtained from the Legislative Reference Service concerning the numbers and sizes of Cuban caves. The information obtained was fragmentary and incomplete.

On March 8, 1963, the Chicago Tribune carried the following story on page 3:

SCANT DATA AVAILABLE IN UNITED STATES ON CUBAN CAVES

WASHINGTON, March 7.—Little public information is available about the thousands of underground caverns in Cuba, some of them of vast size, where Russian troops are reported to be storing large amounts of military equipment and supplies.

It is known, however, that some are a half-mile long, with arching roofs as high as a skyscraper, the ground dry, and the temperature even, capable of storing the biggest missiles and jet bombers, as well as tanks and artillery of lesser size.

Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, has placed in the Congressional Record a report on the Cuban caves which he solicited from the Library of Congress. The report cited some published references to the caves it found in library files but it conceded that information was scarce.

NO SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE

The U.S. Geological Survey, for example, told the library researchers that it had no specific knowledge of the number and sizes of the caves.

This same lack of information apparently extends to the highest intelligence officers. When Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, the Army's Chief of Intelligence, told Senate investigators yesterday of Russian activity indicating underground storage of weapons, his prepared statement first asserted: "There are several hundred caves in Cuba." "Hundreds" was later scratched out and "thousands" substituted.

NOT ALL REMOVED

Fitch noted persistent reports from refugees that not all long-range missiles had been removed from Cuba after the Russian agreement of last October 27. However, he endorsed the official administration position which expressed the "belief" that the Russians have removed all strategic missiles.

The refugee reports contend that 88 medium-range (1,600 miles) missiles were sent to Cuba and that only 42 were withdrawn last fall. The remaining 46 are underground, they assert.

Such missiles easily could be hidden in Cuba's caves, Representative CLEVELAND noted. The Library of Congress reported some studies of the caves in Spanish publications, most of them, however, describing explorations and pictographs found on the walls. One of these was a century-old "guide to the cave of Bellamar," on the San Juan River near Mantanzas Bay.

CLEVELAND said this lack of accurate information concerning the number and location of Cuba's caves was distressing.

"It seems obvious," he said, "that we should have collected this information. For more than 50 years prior to the Castro takeover we had freedom to acquire this information. Our information-gathering programs have lacked selectivity and impetus."

The gentleman from New Hampshire has diligently pursued his research on Cuban caves. On March 9, the Manchester Union-Leader published the following article on page 1:

CLEVELAND ASKS DATA ON CUBAN CAVE NETWORK

WASHINGTON.—A Congressman suggested Friday that if anyone has information on Cuban caves and their weapon-storage capabilities he should forward it to the Library of Congress.

Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, said such data might help the Defense Department and congressional committees. He noted that the Army's chief intelligence officer told the Senate Armed Services Committee Thursday that Cuban caves may hide Soviet weapons.

More than a week ago CLEVELAND told the House there apparently is little accurate information on the size, number or location of Cuba's caves.

"For more than 50 years prior to the Castro takeover," CLEVELAND said, "we had freedom to acquire this information. All of this suggests our information-gathering programs in the past have lacked selectivity and impetus."

I am pleased to report that information is already being received by the Library of Congress.

I wish to applaud the nonpartisan efforts of the gentleman from New Hampshire. He has taken the time and trouble to help Congress obtain sorely needed background information on a matter of importance to all Americans.

Old-Age Care and the Public Purse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on February 25 I arose to praise an action of Wyoming's State Legislature in implementing the Kerr-Mills medical care bill. I now ask unanimous consent to enter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article on that same subject by the distinguished columnist, Holmes Alexander.

Mr. Alexander has noted Wyoming's action in becoming the 28th State to provide medical care for its aged under the joint Federal-State aegis of the Kerr-Mills act.

His comments pay tribute both to Wyoming's State government and the laudability of the Kerr-Mills program.

I ask that they be printed in today's RECORD as further evidence of joint cooperation in meeting the needs of senior citizens through voluntary, economically sound programs managed by State governments.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD-AGE CARE AND THE PUBLIC PURSE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—By the act of its current legislature, Wyoming becomes the 28th State to provide medical care for its aged under the Kerr-Mills Act by which the Federal Government matches State funds.

Although the bill passed the Wyoming House, 39 to 16, and passed the Senate, 27 to 0, the lawmakers are not happy about it. Neither is the Wyoming press. Everybody concerned seems to feel that the problem is bigger than the solution, that the new act is helpful and necessary, but insufficient and imperfect.

All Americans of conscience, I surmise, wish that more could be done for the needy aged. It is a compassion that does the Nation credit, but it should not load us with a guilt complex that can be exploited by the bureau builders and denigrators of this greathearted land.

Old age is a natural law, an act of God, which cannot be repealed by human legislatures. The best that mortals in a self-governing society can do is insure that old persons in need are given medical aid which they, their communities, and their families are not willing or able to provide.

It is equally necessary for State and Federal Governments to keep their guards up against chicanery and freeloading. Welfare racketeering has become a scandal. There are brigands who raid the public treasury behind masks of demagoguery. There are

1963

basis of this figure of 10,000 formally or technically enrolled members.

Thereafter in this speech, Mr. McNamara stated that on the basis of reports filed with the Post Office Department just three Communist publications which could be described as "hard-core"—The Worker, People's World, and National Guardian—had a combined average paid circulation per issue of about 50,000 during the year ending October 1961.

Mr. McNamara pointed out that during the same period, domestic foreign-language publications which have been officially cited as Communist had a circulation of about 46,000 and publications of unions which have been found to be Communist-controlled and expelled from the CIO as such, a circulation of about 150,000. The combined circulation of these various categories of publications, he added, is roughly 250,000.

He said that in estimating readership on the generally accepted ratio of three persons per publication, it would appear that between 700,000 and 800,000 persons in this country regularly read either hard-core party literature or party-line publications.

Mr. McNamara further qualified his estimate with the statement that this is not to be considered a gage of Communist strength because many paid subscriptions to these publications are accounted for by Government security agencies and anti-Communist organizations and individuals, and also by the fact that many Communists and fellow travelers would obviously subscribe to more than one Communist or party-line publication.

And Mr. McNamara concluded that even if as much as 25 percent was to be deducted from the total for these types of readership, we are still faced with the fact that several hundred thousand people in this country are apparently sympathetic readers of hard-core and party-line propaganda.

From the foregoing, Mr. McNamara offered the valid observation that it would be obviously unrealistic to judge the totality of Communist strength and influence in this country by the figure of 10,000 members.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I enclose at this point the Washington Post news report on this speech, published the next day, March 1:

OVER 700,000 REDS BELIEVED IN UNITED STATES

Francis J. McNamara, staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, said last night there was reason to believe there are 700,000 to 800,000 Communists in the United States.

McNamara said he arrived at these figures by totaling the circulation of publications officially cited as subversive and then tripling this number.

He tripled the number in line with standard advertising practice, which estimates there are three readers for every copy, he said.

McNamara admitted this method was vague and nebulous and said the committee did not know for sure the exact number of Communists in the United States.

He pointed out, however, that the figure of 10,000 generally cited as the total of registered Communists, was misleading.

Addressing a meeting of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Young Americans for Freedom, McNamara acknowledged that

there was a growth in sentiment to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. But he cited recent House votes to show the committee was in no danger of being abolished.

The first Washington Post editorial, based on this false news story, appeared March 6. It was as follows:

SEEING REDS

Francis J. McNamara, the staff director of that remarkable research organization, the House Un-American Activities Committee, let it be known recently that there are 700,000 to 800,000 Communists in the United States. This is in rather striking contrast to assertions by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Communist Party reached a top strength of 80,000 in 1944, has declined every year since then and nosedived in 1961 to between 8,000 and 10,000.

Before anyone gets excited and starts talking about tossing Mr. Hoover out of his job as an incompetent, it might be worth while to look critically at Mr. McNamara's computations. He said he arrived at his estimate by totaling the circulation of all publications officially cited as subversive and tripling this number in accordance with the usual advertising hypothesis that there are three readers for every subscriber.

Estimates of this kind used to be arrived at, somewhat haphazardly, by looking at tea leaves or examining the entrails of sheep or multiplying the ambyrath of Q by the coefficient of means square contingencies. But there was always an element of error in such calculations; and anyway the Communists kept complaining that they were being underestimated. Mr. McNamara's method is much more scientific. Naturally it costs a little more money. This, evidently, is why the House of Representatives last week voted, 385 to 20, to give the House Un-American Activities Committee \$360,000 for its scientific investigations this year. The 20 dissenters seem content to hobble along with that old-fashioned FBI.

Meanwhile, 2 days prior to the appearance of this editorial, the following letter to the editor of the Washington Post was mailed by Mr. Vernon W. Holleman, Jr., chairman, Metropolitan Washington chapter of Young Americans for Freedom, protesting the distorted news report.

This letter was published in this morning's Washington Post, in the "Letters to the Editor" column adjoining the editorial of retraction and apology, and is as follows:

COMMUNISTS IN THE UNITED STATES

The headline and lead paragraphs of your March 1 report about the February meeting of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Young Americans for Freedom were completely false and grievously misleading. You quoted Francis McNamara, staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as asserting there is reason to believe that there are "700,000 to 800,000 Communists in the United States."

This is not the truth and it is not what Mr. McNamara said at the meeting. What he did say was that there are approximately 250,000 people in this country who subscribe to Communist publications like the Sunday Worker, foreign-language pro-Soviet publications, Communist-front publications, and party-line publications.

Taking the normal ratio of 3 readers for 1 subscriber he estimated that the readership of hard-core Communist publications, plus those who read general party-line material, totaled about 750,000. Mr. McNamara emphasized that some of these readers were anti-Communist, some were teachers

and students, some were American security personnel; but that even discounting as much as 25 percent there were still a good many thousands of Americans reading the party line every week or month.

Granted his calm, analytical talk was not a "sensational" one, but it was warmly applauded by YAF members in search of the truth—which, unfortunately, they did not find in the Washington Post the next morning.

VERNON W. HOLLEMAN, Jr.

The editorial of apology—acknowledging, in effect, that the distortion in the news report and the admitted bias, venom, and irresponsibility of the early editorial were to much even for the Washington Post to attempt to defend—was carried this morning. It reads as follows:

SEEING RED FACES

A letter from Vernon W. Holleman, Jr., appearing elsewhere on this page today asserts that the Washington Post did an injustice to Francis McNamara, staff director of the House Un-American Activities Committee, in reporting a recent speech by him. A subsequent editorial, Seeing Reds, based on the news story, compounded the injustice. Inquiry has satisfied us that the news story and the editorial were mistaken in imputing to Mr. McNamara the implication that all readers of Communist publications are Communists. We genuinely regret the imputation and the derisory tone of our editorial comment concerning it, and we tender to Mr. McNamara an unequivocal apology.

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include a news story from the Washington Post, two editorials from the Washington Post, and a letter to the editor.)

CUBAN REFUGEE SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House the following resolution as a declaration of the sense of this House:

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, That it is the sense of the House that the entry of Soviet armed forces into Cuba was and the continued presence of such Soviet armed forces in Cuba is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine and a menace to the security of the United States; that the entry of such armed forces into Cuba was and the continued presence there is in violation of the principles of the Organization of American States and a menace to the security of all the American States; that the entry of Soviet armed forces into Cuba was and the continued presence of such forces in Cuba is in violation of the Charter of the United Nations because the presence of such armed forces in Cuba constitutes a threat to the peace of the world:

Wherefore the Government of the United States, in such manner as the President shall determine, should call upon the Organization of American States and the United Nations to join the United States in a demand that the Soviet Union shall forthwith remove all of its armed force from Cuba.

I have also introduced the following joint resolution having to do with the resettlement forthwith of the excess of Cuban refugees now living in Dade County, Fla., which includes my district:

JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON CUBAN REFUGEES

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Cuban Refugee Commission Act".

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON CUBAN REFUGEES

Sec. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Cuban Refugees (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall serve as Chairman.

(c) The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to the compensation for their services as head of a department, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(d) The Commission may utilize the facilities and personnel of the departments under the respective jurisdictions of the members of the Commission.

Duties of the commission

Sec. 3. (a) The Commission shall establish, operate, and maintain a program for the orderly relocation of refugees from Cuba from the Dade County, Florida, area to such other areas within the United States as may be appropriate. Such program shall be conducted with due regard to the job opportunities, housing facilities, public educational facilities, and other pertinent factors existing in each relocation area to the end that an excessive burden shall not be placed on any one relocation area.

(b) The Commission shall initiate and conduct a study, on a continuing basis, of the respective problems involved in the relocation and resettlement within the United States of refugees from Cuba. Such study shall devote particular attention to the economic and social factors involved in such relocation and resettlement with particular reference to job opportunities, housing facilities, educational facilities, and opportunities and facilities in general for adaptation of such refugees in each relocation and resettlement area to the way of life in the United States. The Commission shall submit an annual report to the President for presentation to the Congress of the results of such continuing study together with such recommendations as the Commission deems advisable.

Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Commission, to remain available until expended, such sums (not to exceed the amount of \$25,000,000 annually) as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that those who have criticism to offer about the present threatening and disturbing situation in Cuba owe it to the country to try to do something constructive or to offer criticism which will be helpful in the solution of the grievous burdens respecting that unhappy island which our President now has to bear. We all know the awesome responsibility the President has had to bear to meet the challenge of communistic imperialism in Cuba and to remove from power in the unhappy island of Cuba that creature whose regime has been the source of aggression and subversion against all the American States. The President deserves the commendation of the country—indeed he has received

the acclaim of the Nation—for the courageous and effective manner in which he confronted aggressive communistic imperialism in Cuba and forthwith required before the observing eyes of the world the removal of the offensive missiles and planes which constituted a dangerous threat to the safety of the American people. And the President has received and continues to enjoy the gratification of the country that he is steadily bringing about the removal of Soviet armed forces from Cuba and in his announced determination that the remainder of such forces shall be withdrawn as the spearhead of communistic imperialism in the Western Hemisphere.

But the coming of such Soviet Armed Forces into Cuba and their continued presence in Cuba is a matter of concern not only to the United States, but to every State in the Western Hemisphere and to every peace-loving nation in the world. Such forces strengthen the hand of communistic subversion and aggression in the Western World; they constitute a dire menace and threat to the security of every American state; their presence in Cuba constitutes a distinct and dangerous threat to the peace of the world. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution expressing the sense of this House that the Government of the United States in such manner as the President should determine should call upon the Organization of the American States and the United Nations to join us in a demand that the Soviet Union forthwith remove all of its remaining armed forces from the island of Cuba. The added strength of the Organization of American States and the United Nations to our own demand will give it greater force and power and abate the breach of the Monroe Doctrine, the breach of the principles of the Organization of American States and the breach of the United Nations Charter which their presence in Cuba constitutes.

Mr. Speaker, on the first day this House met in the 88th Congress, I introduced a resolution declaring it to be the sense of this House, among other things, "that the fair Isle of Cuba must and shall be freed of the curse of Castro and communism." I have been assured an early hearing by the subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee upon this resolution. It does not attempt to prescribe for the President of the United States the method by which this high purpose shall be achieved but it does unreservedly and irrevocably declare the sentiment of the Congress of the United States that Castro and communism must go from Cuba and that we shall never falter in our determination that this isle formerly called the Jewel of the Caribbean shall be freed of this curse and the Western Hemisphere of this menace.

I am sure when our President speaks shortly in Costa Rica among those most endangered by the threat of Castro and communism from Cuba he will spell out many ways by which the American States can cooperate with other freedom-loving and peace-loving nations of the world in eradicating Castro and communism from Cuba. It would seem to me that other of the American States

would wish to break all diplomatic relations with Cuba as the United States has done; close their ports to Cuban ships and Cuban exports; require the closing of all Cuban embassies, ministries and consulates in the respective American countries to stop them from continuing to function as hot beds and spawning grounds of communistic aggression and subversion in the several American States; that the several Latin American nations should cooperate more closely with the United States in the coordination of their political, economic and military policies respecting Cuba as long as Castro's or any Communist government shall be in power; that the United States should also call upon all friendly states everywhere in the world to stop commerce with Castro or communistic Cuba and if such states persist in giving aid, strength, and comfort to our enemy in Cuba that we should advise them that neither their ships nor their commerce can enter the United States; that we should not extend economic assistance or cooperation even through international financial institutions to states which manifest that they prefer the friendship of Castro and communistic Cuba to that of the United States. I know we can depend upon our President to do what is the best thing to accomplish the objective upon which we are all united to free Cuba, the Western Hemisphere and the free world from the curse of Castro and communism and to remove the bridgehead of communistic imperialistic aggression from the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, Castro and communistic tyranny in Cuba have brought to Dade County, Fla., some 200,000 Cuban refugees fleeing from communistic terror; many already robbed of all their possessions before they departed, others giving up everything they had in order to breathe the air of freedom in America. Our Government has willingly and gladly given sanctuary to these exiles from communistic persecution and horror; more than that we have been glad and proud to give them succor and sustenance in our country; we have extended to them the hand of fellowship in freedom and given them words of encouragement that we shall hasten the day when they may return to a free Cuba again. But, Mr. Speaker, the congregation of over 200,000 of these refugees in Dade County has imposed a very serious economic burden upon the people of our country. In spite of the some \$70 million a year the Federal Government has given for the sustenance and care and education of the children of these refugees, they still have felt it necessary in order to enjoy a higher level of living or subsistence than the funds federally provided enable them to enjoy to go into our economy and take by responsible estimate some 30,000 jobs. We already had a labor surplus in Dade County. It is inevitable that the refugees willing to work at almost any wage have not only taken the jobs of many of our local citizens, but have lowered the wage scale for all of the people who work in our county. I wish we had jobs enough for our people and a surplus adequate to meet the needs of the refugees.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

3755

I have striven in every way I could to induce the Federal Government to help us to provide more jobs in Dade County; to provide funds to assure Federal participation in Interama which would immediately provide thousands of additional jobs for the people of our county; to aid us in getting defense contracts for which we are in so many ways so much suited; to declare us eligible for the benefits of the area redevelopment program; to aid our small business and otherwise. We are striving to get space-age industries located in Dade County, a natural and highly desirable location for them; we have labored to increase social security benefits, welfare assistance, educational aid and, in short, we have been trying in every way we could to assist our people in the hope that after our own citizens had gainful employment of suitable character there would be a surplus of jobs for the Cuban refugees. But we have not yet reached that point.

The Federal Government has not yet given us the assistance which we feel we are entitled to receive in giving jobs to the unemployed among our own citizens let alone the refugees. We are continuing to struggle to achieve this end. But meanwhile, thousands of our people are out of work, many of them having had their jobs taken by Cuban refugees. Until we can provide enough jobs for our own people and a surplus for the refugees, it is imperative that we immediately institute a resettlement program which will remove to other parts of America—which, I am sure, will also hospitably receive them—the surplus refugees beyond our ability to absorb them in jobs not required by our local people.

The agencies have been working upon the problem, but too little has been done and what has been done has been done too late. Accordingly, I have today introduced a resolution to set up a high level Cabinet committee to institute and immediately to effectuate a resettlement program for the Cuban refugees which will relieve this excessive burden and pressure upon our own people. I hope the Congress will take prompt action upon this resolution and give our people the relief to which we have been long entitled and avoid an unhappy increase in tension which has grown up in Dade County between our displaced citizens and the Cuban refugees on account of their natural effort to better themselves above the level of bare subsistence almost which the bounty of our Government provides.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I want to commend to every Member of this House and the Congress a letter entitled "A communication," appearing in the Sunday, March 10 issue of the Washington Post by the Honorable John C. Wiley, former Ambassador of the United States to Columbia, Iran, Portugal, and Panama, and who, though in retirement, remains an able and wise counselor of his country:

A COMMUNICATION

The public parade of Soviet missiles into Cuba and the complacently public parade of the same missiles out of Cuba appear too obvious for a simple explanation. The Soviet

missile operation clearly had ulterior purposes.

The Soviet Union in Cuba is faced with a variety of problems, but the Cuban thorn in the Soviet foot is Castro himself. He is probably not more popular in the Kremlin than in the White House. Impossible to get along with, it has so far been impossible for the Kremlin to get along without him.

Soviet armed forces are in Cuba neither to attack the United States nor to defend Cuba against the United States. They are not even a saber to rattle. Actually they are a sword over Castro's head.

Monolithic communism exists only when sheltered by Red bayonets. This explains why Soviet garrisons were established in the Baltic States for "mutual security" months before the takeover. It also explains the successful rejection by China, Yugoslavia, and Albania of the primacy of the Kremlin.

The first schismatic was Trotsky. A refugee in a foreign country, armed only with ideas, he was easily disposed of. Mao Tse-tung is no Trotsky. His elimination, were it possible, would not close the chasm with China. Mao represents a massive, organized movement in a great country. When he disappears from the scene his cadres will survive.

But can the Soviet garrisons in Cuba in this late date successfully impose the Kremlin's authority in a remote island under a native leader, a self-anointed Communist and domineering authoritarian who achieved power, like Mao and Tito, without active Soviet assistance?

In Cuba, Soviet authority is, of course, great but it is limited. It has long been clear to Moscow that Castro has quietly become the ally of Mao. Throughout Latin America, the young, fiery Communists are much more attracted by the revolutionary ardor of both Mao and Castro than by, to them, the staid coexistence of Khrushchev. True, Castro's Cuba is dependent on the Soviet Union for desperately needed economic aid and for arms, munitions and military support. In this area, Mao Tse-tung can neither replace nor compete with Khrushchev, but at the same time, Moscow cannot prevent the covert financing of Castroism by China and the clandestine collaboration of Castro with Mao throughout Latin America.

Effective foreign policy is based on alternative courses of action. This is a principle followed by the Soviet Union as demonstrated over long years by frequent zigzags. What alternative policies can the Kremlin pursue toward Castro; what zigs and which zags?

Only three alternatives seem to exist. The first would be for the Soviet Union to wash its hands of the whole Cuban affair. This is obviously out of the question, if only for compelling reasons of prestige. The second alternative would be for the Soviet Union and Communist China to divide the world into two noncompetitive geographical spheres of influence. Such a pact would be difficult to negotiate and still more difficult to carry out. Neither could trust the other. The third alternative is draconian, the harsh decision to eliminate Castro and replace him with someone subject to monolithic Kremlin discipline. This move is doubtless the only feasible choice, but it is one that requires subtle and careful preparation and great operational skill.

The elimination of Castro would not be foreign to Soviet procedures, but it would now be premature. First, Castro is still an asset internally in Cuba and his departure might precipitate the open break with Peking that Moscow wishes to postpone until the moment arrives for a still harsher decision: what to do to prevent Communist China from developing sophisticated atomic weapons, and when to do it.

However, the Soviet Union is certainly preparing the elimination of Castro at the opportune moment, namely when it becomes either convenient or unavoidably necessary. This would probably be accomplished by one of two techniques: (1) a connived military coup by trusted elements of the Cuban Army and militia, or (2) to have Castro suddenly and officially declared insane, to which an element of plausibility would not be lacking. Then Castro would be immediately incarcerated in padded luxury on the shores of the Caspian.

Hopes rampant among Cuban refugees that disaffection in the Cuban armed forces will lead to the overthrow of Castroism are as illusory as the conception that led to the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. Without a simultaneous invasion by the United States, any anti-Castro initiative within Cuba, not contrived by the Kremlin, could and would be quickly suppressed.

But what about the Soviet missile bases in Cuba? Surely Khrushchev did not need missile bases within Cuba itself in order to keep Castro in line.

Obviously not, but they have served as a supremely astute stratagem with Castro for the introduction of Soviet armed forces into Cuba, not merely forces to defend the Communist regime against internal disaffection, but primarily to deal with Castro whenever desirable or necessary.

The missile bases in Cuba were indeed a magnificent multipurpose example of Soviet guile. They were a tit for the tat of American missile bases on the very fringes of Russia. Moreover, in addition to their intrinsic military value, they constituted excellent bargaining pawns for the removal of our bases from Italy and Turkey. And whether the missiles introduced into and removed from Cuba were genuine or Potemkin stage settings, they were excellent weapons for psychological (political) warfare. Now, the only effective opposition to Castro in Cuba is the Soviet Union itself. In any event, Khrushchev deserves credit for having perpetrated the most brilliant stroke of international chicanery of the of the present century.

The Soviet Union continues to threaten war on the American mainland if the United States attacks Cuba. This is putting dry froth on stale beer. The Soviet Union knows perfectly well that the United States has no intention of attacking Cuba, just as we know perfectly well that the Soviet Union has no intention of attacking us with nuclear weapons should we do so. However, there is always the dangerous possibility that American activities with regard to Cuba might help to incite the old, perhaps compulsive urge of the messianic Russians to seek new pastures—pastures and warm waters—and serve as a precedent for so doing. This possibility has not been diminished by developments in Iraq and Yemen.

Middle East petroleum, or rather the threat of its denial to the West, could easily press the button of the holocaust. Under existing circumstances, Cuba does not involve the vital interests of any, except the Cubans themselves. On the other hand, the Middle East touches the vital interests of many. A cradle of civilization, it could be its deathbed.

JOHN C. WILEY,

Former Ambassador to Colombia, Iran, Portugal, and Panama, who retired from the Foreign Service in 1956.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. CLANCY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

3756

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House this afternoon in approving the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act serves a necessary and practical need. With world tensions growing rather than lessening, our Armed Forces remain the protectors of peace in the world, serving as they do not only in defense of the United States but also protecting the security of all free world nations.

The Soviet Union, in its consistent propaganda, attempts to don the mantle of peace but their policies remain clear to observers, that is, the hope for world domination.

America is free, America maintains leadership in the world because of our tremendous military establishment. The extension of the draft is necessary, and I commend my colleagues of the House Armed Services Committee for the rapid manner in which they processed this proposal, the first major legislation approved by the House.

AIDING RUSSIA AND NEWS MANIPULATION

(Mr. HARSHA (at the request of Mr. CLANCY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the news managers are back in rare form. They have left no stone unturned in trying to hoodwink the public. The Brazilian Government previously announced it was sending a mission, headed by Finance Minister San Thiago Dantes, to Washington to seek liberalized terms on existing loans and \$1.5 billion in new U.S. loans and investments over a 3-year period. Part of the 3-year plan the United States would be asked to help finance was a \$160 million per year long-term agreement between Brazil and Russia, but this fact is being cleverly concealed.

Previously, a meeting between the State Department and the Brazilian mission was scheduled for March 4. This meeting was postponed until today. I had previously requested an explanation from Secretary of State Rusk as to why the U.S. Government would entertain any transaction or negotiation for any sum, whether it be \$1.5 billion or \$1, to enhance trade negotiations between Brazil and Russia. To date, I have received no answer.

The State Department's foreign policy with Latin America is "an exercise in futility." The administration is calling for \$11 billion to be spent in curtailing the Communist threat in Latin America and now the State Department is entertaining negotiations with Brazil to help finance and expand a trade program with that country and Communist Russia. The result of such a deal would enhance the Reds' position in Latin America and make our expenditures futile.

Last Monday, a release was issued that the U.S. Government and Brazil were planning to start high level, economic talks in Washington, March 11, to determine America's disposition toward new

aid commitments to Brazil. Nothing in the release indicated that any part of U.S. funds would be used to help finance the trade agreement between Brazil and Russia, although State Department officials knew this to be true.

I have made inquiries to the State Department concerning this matter and have been told that Brazil probably would not get as much as she was asking for. Subsequent to this, another release was issued pointing out that Brazil's finance minister would be here today to negotiate further loans and a "qualified source" indicated the sum would be in the neighborhood of \$450 to \$500 million. Here again, nothing was said as to what plans had been developed for the expenditure of this money. Whether it is \$1.5 billion, \$450 million, or \$1 makes no difference. The American taxpayer does not want his money used to expand Russian trade with any country.

The camouflaged releases prove once again that the news managers are working at their best. A commitment like this is preposterous and to delude the American taxpayer by deliberately managing the news, when the officials in the State Department know that portions of these funds will be used to help finance and expand Communist trade with Brazil, is not in the best interests of our national security and under no circumstances can it be justified.

Not only is any negotiation that would enhance Red trade foolhardy and detrimental to our national security, but in direct conflict with the stated purposes of our tremendous defense budget and foreign aid outlays. Managing the news is most dangerous and detrimental to our national security, and it is done for one purpose and one purpose only and that is to control our thinking.

We should not be treated as a mass unable to comprehend. The American taxpayer is entitled to know where his money is going, he's paid enough tuition. News manipulators should be ferreted out along with those who are advocating such a disastrous loan. I believe Congress should take a long, hard look at any such policy. The administration should state publicly that it does not advocate a policy of enhancing the Soviet economy and call a halt to such ludicrous negotiations.

SPEND, SPEND, SPEND TODAY SO YOU CAN SPEND TOMORROW, TOO

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. CLANCY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think I would be naive indeed to say that we in Congress are not aware of the unwritten law of bureaucracy that requires the spending of all appropriations so that future requests for larger appropriations can thus be justified.

Seldom, however, do we find that this unwritten law has been put down in writing. But I have at hand a column written by Maj. Gen. Frederick M. War-

ren which appeared under the title "The Chief's Column," in the February issue of the Army Reservist.

General Warren, who is Chief of Army Reserve and ROTC Affairs, exhorts all unit commanders to draw all equipment to which they are entitled on paper, apparently without regard to the needs of the units or whether they are at full strength or half strength.

Writes General Warren:

Failure to draw this equipment not only could have an adverse effect on future equipment budgets, but also on programs for increased storage facilities, maintenance technicians, spare parts and tools.

The important thing, according to this message, is to draw the equipment so that it will all be used up and therefore justified. I suggest that the Appropriations Committees will want to examine this activity most closely, especially since we were told that high school ROTC had to be sacrificed due to budget needs. General Warren is in charge of Reserve and ROTC. It is apparent to me that ROTC was to be sacrificed to the bureaucratic habit of drawing all equipment, spending all the money, and making a good justification in the ledger books on which to base future budget requests.

I understand the Pentagon has backed down some on its plan to abolish high school ROTC. Indeed they had better do that and also see that the old army game of "spend today so you can get more tomorrow" is given even closer attention.

The article referred to will be inserted at the end of my remarks, but I would call the attention to two other passages which clearly indicate to me that the instructions in this case are based solely on the desire to show Congress that there is a need for more money because all the previously appropriated money was used up.

Note these two passages:

An additional danger in the conversion of functional use of space is that failure to use space for functions prescribed in approved space criteria, can bring about the elimination of that space on the basis that it is not required since it is not used for the designated purpose.

In the end, by having the equipment on hand, the need for additional supporting technicians, spare parts and the required extension of facilities will be clear for all to see.

Copies of this material will be directed to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. I am certain it will be of value and interest in both committees.

The entire article is as follows:

THE CHIEF'S COLUMN

A matter of vital concern to all of us is the amount of equipment available to support the Army Reserve. Equipment must be available in Army Reserve centers to conduct proper home station training on a year-round basis.

Additional equipment is essential to meet the expanded requirements of summer camp training. The Berlin callup emphasized the need for equipment to meet mobilization requirements.

As a direct result of the Berlin callup, additional funds have been provided in Army

1963

adequate outdoor recreational opportunity for living Americans—today—and for generations yet unborn—tomorrow. Prominent among these recommendations was one to establish in the Federal Government a bureau to act as a focal point for the planning and coordination of outdoor recreation programs. The need for such an organization was so obvious and so urgent that the administration, acting under the authority of the Reorganization Act of 1950, shifted certain funds and certain functions from other bureaus and established in the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

A bill introduced in the last Congress, which passed the Senate, would have given formal congressional sanction to this action. That bill, however, included an additional provision for grants to the States for outdoor recreational planning, and at the late stage in the session when it reached the House, it was not possible for that body to explore sufficiently all the ramifications of the proposal, so the measure was not enacted. This bill we are considering today, S. 20, does not include that provision. Its purpose is to give congressional recognition to the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and to delineate what its functions and responsibilities shall be.

Attempts have been made to demonstrate a relationship between this measure and S. 859 which would establish a land and water conservation fund and provide how such a fund would be used. But at this time I want to point out emphatically that there is no connection between these two measures other than that both relate to outdoor recreation. This bill, S. 20, gives specific statutory status to a small bureau which can coordinate the outdoor recreational activities of more than 20 Federal and more than 500 State agencies which have responsibilities in this field. Further, this Bureau will act as a focal point for the planning needed to assure the orderly development of the facilities required to meet the mushrooming demands of Americans for outdoor recreational opportunity. Its budget request is moderate, only \$1,115,000 more than has been appropriated in the past for two National Park Service functions now being performed by that Bureau.

Yet it has the mission of developing a national outdoor recreation plan, of coordinating State recreational planning, of aiding the States in all aspects of outdoor recreation, of reviewing and coordinating the outdoor recreational programs of some 20 Federal agencies to prevent overlap, eliminate unnecessary expense, and to assure that Federal investment in this field is best designed to meet national needs, of stimulating needed research, and of disseminating needed information and educational material.

It contemplates a staff of only 225 employees to perform its broad responsibilities.

This is a long-needed planning and coordinating agency in the outdoor recreation field. It will prevent waste and

duplication of effort. It will see that Federal, State and local recreation programs follow an orderly pattern. Its formation follows the recommendation of a bipartisan commission established during the last administration. I urge passage of S. 20.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question now is, Shall it pass?

MR. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the bill was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable, and that prompt and coordinated action is required by all levels of government and by private interests on a nationwide basis to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, after consultation with the Recreation Advisory Council and with the heads of Federal departments and agencies concerned, to perform the following functions and activities:

(a) **INVENTORY.**—Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States.

(b) **CLASSIFICATION.**—Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources to assist in the effective and beneficial use and management of such resources.

(c) **NATIONWIDE PLAN.**—Formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, taking into consideration the plans of the various Federal agencies, States and their political subdivisions. The plan shall set forth the needs and demands of the public for outdoor recreation and the current and foreseeable availability in the future of outdoor recreation resources to meet those needs. The plan shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems, recommend solutions, and identify the desirable actions to be taken at each level of government and by private interests. The Secretary shall transmit the initial plan, which shall be prepared as soon as practicable within five years hereafter, to the President for transmittal to the Congress. Future revisions of the plan shall be similarly transmitted at succeeding five-year intervals. When a plan or revision is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies to the Governors of the several States.

(d) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—Provide technical assistance and advice to and cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and private interest including nonprofit organizations with respect to outdoor recreation.

(e) **REGIONAL COOPERATION.**—Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(f) **RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.**—(1) Spon-

sor, engage in, and assist in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreements, and make payments for such purposes, including advance payments without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (39 U.S.C. 4154) for initial costs of such research to any educational institution or other nonprofit organizations when necessary and in the public interest; (2) undertake studies and assemble information concerning outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreement, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 321n, title 39, United States Code; and (3) cooperate with educational institutions and others in order to assist in establishing education programs and activities and to encourage public use and benefits from outdoor recreation.

(g) **INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION.**—(1) Cooperate with and provide technical assistance to Federal departments and agencies and obtain from them information, data, reports, advice, and assistance that are needed and can reasonably be furnished in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and (2) promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation. Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

(h) **DONATIONS.**—Accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. The term "United States" as used in this Act shall include the District of Columbia; and, to the extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the terms "United States" and "States" may include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

MR. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY AND PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Thursday next, it is the intention of the leadership to call up the money resolutions which affect the conduct of affairs of the various committees during the year.

A DES MOINES NEGRO VIEW

MR. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at

March 11

this point in the RECORD an article entitled "District of Columbia Negro Paper Backs POWELL," written by Richard Wilson and published in the Des Moines Sunday Register of March 3, 1963.

The article relates some of the problems with respect to the recent furor over the actions of a Member of the House of Representatives, and also includes an editorial entitled "A Des Moines Negro View," which first appeared in the Iowa Bystander, a weekly newspaper published at Des Moines by and for Negroes. The editorial takes a point of view of the situation entirely different from that expressed in a Washington, D.C., newspaper published for Negroes.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Mar. 3, 1963]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NEGRO PAPER BACKS POWELL

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Critics of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL should not indulge in the illusion that he lacks prestige in the nationwide Negro community, or that the recent attacks on POWELL have shaken this prestige very much.

POWELL is much admired as a symbol even by those who may deplore some of his acts. He seems to many Negroes to be one of their race who has broken through racial prejudice to stand on his own as an individual.

In Washington, with its 54 percent Negro population and its 84 percent Negro school enrollment, criticism of POWELL raps on raw nerves in the Negro community.

REACTION ANGRILY

The Washington Afro-American, one of the chain of newspapers which strongly affects Negro opinion, reacted angrily to the attempt of Clark R. Mollenhoff of the Register's Washington bureau to pin down POWELL at a press conference. The prize-winning investigative reporter was probing POWELL on the charges of Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, who accuses POWELL of extensive abuses of his congressional position with the connivance of Kennedy administration officials.

The reporter, a Drake University football star once optioned to the New York Giants, was criticized in a page 1 story in the Afro-American both for his questions and his physical condition.

"The pasty-faced Mollenhoff, who resembled a former shotputter who has let himself go to pot, tried repeatedly with just a trace of preciousness in his slightly hisping voice to put POWELL on the spot," the article stated. It continued with its derision of the reporter but told little of either the questions or answers at the press conference.

An editorial in the Afro-American elaborated on these views, centering its attack on Senator WILLIAMS and Columnist Drew Pearson. The editorial predicted the day would come when "this great civil rights fighter [POWELL] attains even greater heights."

"When he does," the editorial continued, "18 million colored thumbs are going to go up to 18 million colored noses to remind Drew Pearson and Senator WILLIAMS that 'what's good for you white geese is sure good for us colored ganders.'"

The editor of the Washington Afro-American is C. Sumner Stone, Jr., who signed his name to the page 1 news article as "Chuck Stone."

Stone will not long remain as editor of the Afro-American. He has been appointed public affairs officer in the U.S. Information Service and will be placed in charge of the office in Tanganyika. His responsibility there will be to carry out programs of USIA intended to give to the residents of the former British colony in east Africa a clear and accurate picture of conditions, opinions, attitudes, and culture of the United States.

Stone says that he expects to go to Tanganyika in April. He reinforces in conversation his views stated in the Afro-American.

"I could take you into the bars and barber shops and street corners in Washington and show you that 95 percent of the colored people think that the attack on POWELL was clearly racial," he says.

"POWELL has pulled a lot of deals we don't like, but if he is going to be criticized it has got to be on the Negro's terms."

ANOTHER NEGRO VIEW

It is impossible to convince Stone and most Negroes within sound and sight of POWELL that WILLIAMS was inspired by anything but racial feelings in spite of his long record to the contrary, and in spite of the role he has played over many years in the exposure of serious abuses in Government.

Negroes sharing the view of Stone, and only grudgingly aware of POWELL's long and flagrant violation of generally accepted congressional standards, white or Negro, cannot conceive of any but a racial reason for WILLIAMS' attack.

This is saddening. It is more saddening that POWELL can play upon the misguided Negro racism which is so evident in the words and tone of the Washington Afro-American.

The dialog between the races in Washington does not seem to be improving in anywhere near the measure that the circumstances justify. Nor is it reassuring that the well-mannered, well-dressed, but passionately spoken Stone is going to Tanganyika to interpret America to the people and officialdom of an emerging nation.

DIFFERENT VIEW

Wet get quite a different view than Stone's of Negro attitudes when another Negro journalist, Simeon Booker, of Ebony magazine, speaks. Booker is writing a book which he intends to make a balanced account of the need for Negro self-improvement as well as a plea for the opening of fairer opportunities.

He points out that POWELL does not have much support or sympathy "among people who think." Booker's tool is rationality; Stone's is emotion; POWELL's is flimflam.

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Mar. 3, 1963]

A DES MOINES NEGRO VIEW

(The following editorial appeared in the Iowa Bystander, a weekly newspaper published at Des Moines by and for Negroes.)

It often happens that some people, placed in a position of responsibility and prominence, use this situation to abuse it by doing things a far less prepared citizen does. Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, is an excellent example of this.

A minister of one of the largest churches in America, elected from a district comprising mostly Negroes and Puerto Ricans, POWELL has moved up to chairmanship of the Health, Education, and Welfare Committee. In this post, he could be a power in Congress and serve as an example for younger people to point to with pride that a Negro had attained such a commanding position.

There are those who opposed his elevation to that high post but the system of seniority made the choice automatic.

However, Representative POWELL, unlike some other Negroes serving in Congress, has abused his position by his continued absenteeism from duty, by loading up his staff far out of proportion to the other chairmen. He has abused the expenditure of public funds and he has failed or refused to pay his taxes to the Government which pays his salary.

These derelictions of duty have brought stern criticism from Members of both Houses to the extent never before witnessed, and all because the charges lodged against him are true.

Here is a public servant, a minister who, instead of conducting himself in a straightforward manner, has done many things which bring disgrace, distrust, and shame, while representing a district whose people are entitled to a leader who should bring honor and prestige to the position which he holds. There is no excuse for Representative POWELL's conduct. It should not be condoned.

ADLAI STEVENSON'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE SOVIETS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Wilson Finds Adlai Slow To Understand Soviets," written by Richard Wilson and published in the Des Moines Register of March 7, 1963.

In his article, Mr. Wilson, a distinguished columnist, indicates some concern over the fact that the U.S. representative to the United Nations has apparently taken such a long time to come to grips with the nature of the international Communist conspiracy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILSON FINDS ADLAI SLOW TO UNDERSTAND SOVIETS

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In an interview with the Associated Press, Adlai E. Stevenson has revealed the attitude of mind toward Russian negotiations which so many have found hard to understand.

With 2 years' experience as U.N. Ambassador, Stevenson says that he has changed his mind about the Russians. He has discovered that they will stubbornly support positions which they seem fully prepared to reverse when it is expedient to do so.

It seems odd that Stevenson would have had to learn such a lesson, for this has been the uniform experience of Secretaries of State for the last quarter of a century. Stevenson has been a student of foreign affairs for at least that long.

EXPECTED RUSSIA TO ACCOMMODATE

Stevenson's statement is implicit confirmation that the Kennedy administration came into office with the belief that a new set of conditions with Russia could be created. The United States should be able to accommodate itself in some ways to Russian policy, and, in turn, if the negotiators were skillful enough, Russian policy would make accommodations, too.

Thus Secretary Rusk began his "quiet" diplomatic moves. President Kennedy conferred with Premier Khrushchev. New thoughts were formulated by Walt W. Rostow, McGeorge Bundy, and Paul Nitze.

Under almost all conditions new solutions were pursued. About all this has proved was that the American political administration had changed, but the Russian political administration had not.

1963

Still, the idea that the Russians could somehow be made to see the light was hard to put down. This frame of mind has persisted right through the Cuban crisis, manifesting itself in the care exercised in not pushing Khrushchev too far, too fast when he was so obviously on the run.

THINKS RUSSIANS CAN BE HANDLED

The result, to borrow a phrase from Communist Arthur Krock, has been half-won victories, which the administration continually advertises as great triumphs.

In the wake of Khrushchev's withdrawal of missiles from Cuba a wave of euphoria washed over Washington. Large but poorly described changes were foreseen. There were premonitions of some new order in the world based on Khrushchev's back down and his quarrel with his Chinese allies. It was supposed that the noncommitted nations were losing their fascination with Russia. Administration officials spoke of the missile withdrawal as if it were some historic turning point.

But now all the airy castles built on the shifting sands of the imagined new world order are coming tumbling down. The cold war seems to have been renewed. Khrushchev is seen to have achieved important objectives in Cuba, though not all he sought. The test ban negotiations are again in a state of collapse. We are warned once again that Russia will burn us up if we touch Cuba.

TROOPS ARE STILL THERE

It does not appear that there is much to be gained by not pressing advantages against the Soviet Union to their full limit when it was possible to do so, as in Cuba. Now, months after the fullest pressure could have been brought, Russian troops are still in Cuba. We do not know how many are being taken out. Nor have we achieved all the aims we sought when we confronted the world with the imminent prospect of nuclear war.

There is enough now to confirm Stevenson's newfound wisdom about the Russians. We should keep the pressure on them when we can and gain the most from it. Only too soon they will have found new ways to move toward their unchanging general objectives.

SUMMERTIME STUDENT JOBS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Plum Jam," published in the Milwaukee Sentinel of March 7, 1963. The editorial relates to the recent announcement that appointments of student trainees to Federal jobs during the summertime will be cleared through the White House.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PLUM JAM

Each year, more than 10,000 students are given summer jobs by the Federal Government. The jobs mainly are in Washington. Quite a bit of personal political patronage is involved, although the Civil Service Commission requires applicants to pass civil service examinations for clerical, typist, and stenographer jobs. In the case of student trainee jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

Now a storm of protest has blown up in Congress following a report in the Washington Star that the White House has taken

control of student job patronage. A clearance system reportedly has been set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House, along with information as to home States and the college attended (if any).

Assuming that it is essential in the first place to hire 10,000 students for summer Federal work, the action of the White House in having them all run through the Presidential funnel for clearance fouls the civil service system. Worse yet, this latest action appears to be but another example of a New Frontier attitude that is disdainful of the spirit, if not the law, of Federal civil service.

In a Senate speech rapping the White House student patronage plan, Senator MILLER, Republican, of Iowa, accused the administration of having "an irresistible urge to play politics with our civil service system."

"First," Senator MILLER recalled, "there was the shocking directive to civil service employees that they should be expected to participate in trying to sell proposed new programs to the general public. This was belatedly and grudgingly withdrawn due to the revulsion of the public in general and career civil service employees in particular. Next our civil service employees were pressured to buy \$100 tickets to the Democratic fund raising dinner here through the clever device of having them invited to cocktail parties of their bosses if they had purchased a ticket. . . . And now, this administration apparently is not going to wait until people have civil service status for an opportunity to engage in partisan political activities."

The Kennedy administration defends the plan by saying that its primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when the youths graduate.

Despite this high sounding explanation, the plan is high handed. It's something new in the way of harvesting political plums—pick 'em while they're green.

DELAY SOUGHT ON FEED GRAIN PROGRAM UNTIL AFTER WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Shuman Asks Congress To Wait until after Wheat Referendum To Write Farm Laws," published in the American Farm Bureau Federation's official newsletter of March 4, 1963, together with table 1, which indicates the various factors which have occurred in the reduction of the carryover of feed grains. The table points up in an excellent way why the reduction of the carryover in feed grains is due in very minute part to the emergency feed grain program of the last 2 years.

There being no objection, the article and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SHUMAN ASKS CONGRESS TO WAIT UNTIL AFTER WHEAT REFERENDUM TO WRITE FARM LAWS

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has urged Congress to delay any decision on the type of feed grain program to be in effect after 1963.

He said the legislators should wait until after the signup under the 1963 feed grain program has been completed and the result of the forthcoming wheat referendum is known.

At a House Agriculture subcommittee hearing last Thursday, Mr. Shuman said that if the wheat referendum carries, "there still will be ample time to consider and adopt a feed grain program for 1964."

"If the wheat referendum does not carry, which we think more likely, then by all means this committee and the Congress should consider wheat and feed grains together."

"There is urgent need for a more effective, less costly, and less disruptive program," the Farm Bureau president declared.

"We pledge our support in helping to develop such a program when the results of the wheat referendum are known."

Here is the full text of Mr. Shuman's statement at the hearing:

"We appreciate the opportunity to discuss the operation and results of the 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs. We also would like to comment briefly on the 1963 feed grain program and its implications. Finally, we would like to discuss with this committee a course of action which we believe would be wise and best for farmers."

"Before we get into a detailed discussion of the feed grain program, we would like to urge strongly that this committee delay any decision on the type of feed grain program to be in effect after 1963, until (1) the sign-up under the 1963 feed grain program has been completed and announced and (2) the multiple-price wheat referendum has been held and the result is known."

Our reasons for asking the committee to delay any decision on a feed grain program are:

1. Most feed grains are spring planted. There will be ample time, after the wheat referendum, for action by Congress on a future program for feed grains.

2. The sign-up for the 1963 feed grain program will continue until at least March 22 (or later if the time is extended). No one knows until then what feed grain producer reaction will be to the 1963 compensatory payment program.

3. If the complicated, restrictive, multiple-price wheat program is approved in the upcoming referendum, one set of circumstances will prevail. On the other hand, if it is voted down, this will create substantially different conditions for wheat, feed grain, and livestock producers. If this happens, this committee and the Congress would then most certainly want to reanalyze the entire wheat, feed grain, and livestock problem in order to do justice to all producers. This committee should not tie its own hands by acting prematurely, without having all the facts necessary for sound judgment.

You are well aware of the fact that Farm Bureau has a membership of over 1,607,000 farm families in 49 States and Puerto Rico. Most of our members produce feed grains and livestock although many, of course, have a larger economic stake in other commodities. A large number produce wheat and feed grains. Our members strongly believe that feed grain and wheat legislation are closely related and that both affect livestock production and prices. We strongly believe that any future programs for feed grains and wheat should be considered together.

RESULTS OF 1961 AND 1962 FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

The administration claims that the so-called emergency feed grain program has been a great success, since the buildup in supplies has been halted and some progress has been made in reducing carryover stocks. What are the facts?

Fact 1. A sizable majority of the eligible producers gave the program a "no confidence" vote by staying out, both in 1961 and 1962.

In 1961 only 42 percent of the farmers with corn and grain sorghum bases signed program contracts. In 1962 contracts were

signed by 44 percent of the producers with corn and grain sorghum bases and 29 percent of those with barley bases.

Fact. 2. The acreage that was diverted under the program did not result in a corresponding reduction in feed grain plantings.

In 1961 the Government contracted for approximately 4 acres for each 3 acres by which corn and grain sorghum plantings were reduced from the 1959-60 base. In 1962 it contracted for approximately 5 acres for each 3½ acres by which corn, grain sorghums, and barley were reduced from the 1959-60 base.

In 1959-60 the total acreage planted to the four principal feed grains averaged 151.3 million acres.

In 1961 farmers planted 129.3 million acres to feed grains and were paid for diverting 26.7 million acres. Thus, the total of 156 million acres planted or diverted in 1961 was 4.7 million acres greater than 1959-60 plantings.

In 1962 farmers planted 125.9 million acres to feed grains and were paid for diverting 32.7 million acres. Thus, the total planted plus the acreage diverted rose to 158.6 million acres, or 7.3 million acres more than the average planted in 1959-60.

The increase in feed grain acreage (including diverted acreage) under the program reflects increased plantings by non-participating farmers and adjustments in the base acreage of participating producers.

Fact 3. The production of feed grains was reduced less than the reduction in acreage planted because yields increased.

Apologists for the program have attributed most of the 1961 increase in yields to weather. But yields rose again in 1962. (Per-acre corn yields averaged 53.8 bushels in 1959-60 and rose to 62 bushels in 1961 and 64.1 bushels in 1962.)

In 1961, as compared with the base period 1959-60, the acreage devoted to four feed grains was reduced 14.5 percent and the production of four feed grains (total tonnage basis) was reduced 7.9 percent.

In 1962, as compared with the 1959-60 base, the acreage devoted to four feed grains was reduced 16.8 percent and the production of four feed grains was reduced 6.2 percent.

Fact 4. The reduction in feed grain stocks has been due almost entirely to increased utilization and not to the Government program.

At the beginning of the 1961 marketing year, feed grain stocks totaled a record of 84.7 million tons.

By the beginning of the current marketing year stocks had been reduced to 71.8 million tons. Only a very small part of this reduction of 12.9 million tons can be attributed to the feed grain program.

The production of feed grains was reduced 15 million tons in 1961, but barley and oats—which were not included in the 1961 program—accounted for 3.1 million tons of this reduction.

One of the most significant factors in the feed grain situation is the increase in utilization which has been occurring. Domestic consumption and exports of feed grains increased 8.1 million tons in the marketing year 1961 (as compared with 1960).

To summarize, under the 1961 program, stocks were reduced 12.9 million tons, but if there had been no increase in utilization and no reduction in the production of feed grains not covered by the 1961 program, the reduction in carryover would have been less than 2 million tons.

It now appears that stocks will be reduced 10.8 million tons (from 71.8 to 61 million) during the 1962 marketing year. This reduction is almost entirely accounted for by increased utilization and a reduction in the production of oats. As compared with 1961, total production of feed grains increased 2.5

million tons (from 140.6 million tons to 143.1 million tons) and exports are expected to decline by about 1.7 million tons this year.

By the fall of 1962, feed grain stocks will have been reduced by a total of approximately 23.7 million tons from the 1961 level. But, if there had been no increase in utilization and no reduction in production of crops not under the program, the total reduction in stocks would be only a little over 2 million tons (see table 1). Thus, 90 percent of the reduction in feed grain carryover was due to factors other than the effect of the emergency program.

Fact 5. The total direct cost—\$1.7 billion—of the 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs cannot be justified by what has actually been accomplished under these programs.

MARKET PRICES DEPRESSED

Early in 1961, when this committee was discussing the 1961 feed grain program we spoke out against one of its most disturbing features. We called this the obvious threat to use the Government's huge surplus stocks to beat down the market price of feed grains. We denounced this proposal as a brandnew and fallacious concept. We continued to oppose the dumping of CCC feed grain stocks during the 1962 program. We have continually pointed out that this use of CCC stocks is bad for our market system for grain and that it severely penalizes producers who want to sell their feed grains on the market.

As we have already pointed out, considerably more than 50 percent of all feed grain producers stayed out of the feed grain program in 1961 and in 1962. Dumping CCC feed grains on the market held down their market price and, of course, lowered their incomes.

We also pointed out early in 1961 that dumping feed grain stocks onto the market would ultimately adversely affect poultry, dairy, and livestock production and prices for these commodities. Let us review briefly what has happened in this regard.

Poultry and dairy production have continued above what they would have been if CCC stocks of feed grains had not been dumped. Prices of both these commodities have been depressed because of this unwise action.

Numbers of hogs coming to market and cattle on feed and being marketed are also up considerably. Hog prices are down, and top cattle prices have taken one of the sharpest drops in history—over \$7.00 per hundredweight since last fall. This, too, has been caused in part by the dumping of CCC stocks of feed grain.

We realize that some persons have supported the feed grain program on the ground that it has been an effective way of pouring "free money" from Washington into the feed grain areas. But what is happening currently to livestock, dairy, and poultry prices would indicate a loss in income to feed grain, poultry, dairy, hog, and cattle producers of several times the payments made to feed grain growers under the 1961 and 1962 programs.

THE 1963 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

As we stated previously, it is too early to determine the reaction of feed grain producers to the 1963 program and the results that can be anticipated from its operation. The sign-up period has several weeks to run.

The 1963 program has most of the bad features of the 1961 and 1962 programs and, in addition, contains a provision for Brannan-type compensatory payments. Since payments are to be made on the "normal" yield of planted acres, they encourage producers to participate on a minimum basis and to divert their poorest acres.

As members of this committee know, we are opposed to the compensatory payment

concept. Our reasons for opposing payments are spelled out in our 1963 policies as adopted by the voting delegates of the member State Farm Bureaus:

"Compensatory payments are proposed in a variety of forms. Regardless of the form in which presented, the payment approach is unsound and dangerous to our economic and political system. It would be fantastically expensive and would stimulate production, increase unit costs, depress market prices, lead to tight production controls, and make farmers dependent on congressional appropriations for a substantial part of their total income.

"Limitations on payments to individuals would place a ceiling on opportunity and level farm incomes downward.

"Payment programs would socialize the production and distribution of food and fiber by having consumers pay a part of the cost through taxes—rather than full value at the store. This is a trap for producers. Ultimately, the payment approach also would be a trap for consumers, since it would encourage inefficiency and thereby result in high real costs of food and fiber.

"We vigorously oppose any system of compensatory payments for agriculture."

In summary, we strongly urge this committee to delay any further action on a feed grain program until after the multiple price wheat referendum. If the wheat referendum carries, there still will be ample time to consider and adopt a feed grain program for 1964. If the wheat referendum does not carry (which we think more likely), then by all means this committee and the Congress should consider wheat and feed grains together.

Finally, we have pointed out why we believe the 1961, 1962, and 1963 feed grain programs have not, and will not, solve the basic problem in feed grain and livestock agriculture. There is urgent need for a more effective, less costly, and less disruptive program. We pledge our support in helping to develop such a program when the results of the wheat referendum are known.

TABLE 1.—Factors in the reduction of feed grain stocks
(In million tons)

	1961	1962	Total
Reduction in production from 1960 of crops covered by program:			
Corn.....	7.9	7.4	15.3
Grain sorghum.....	4.0	3.1	7.1
Barley.....	—	0	0
Total.....	11.9	10.5	22.4
Reduction in production from 1960 of crops not covered by program:			
Barley.....	.8	—	.8
Oats.....	2.3	2.0	4.3
Total.....	3.1	2.0	5.1
Increase in utilization from 1960 marketing year.....	8.1	8.3	16.4
Net effect of reduction in production of crops not covered by program and increase in utilization on carryover.....	-11.2	-10.3	-21.5
Total reduction in carryover.....	12.9	10.8	23.7
Reduction in carryover due to feed grain program.....	1.7	.5	2.2

NOTE.—It may be argued that the carryover would have increased if there had been no feed grain program. The point, however, is that the program has done little except to stop the buildup. The reduction in accumulated stocks is almost entirely due to increased utilization and reduced production of feed crops not covered by the program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.